TRUTH DEFENDED:

AND THE

Friends thereof Cleared,

FROM THE

alse Charges, Foul Reproaches, and Envious Cavils, cast upon It and Them, by

George Keith,

(An *Apostate* from them)

n Two BOOKS by him lately Published:

The One being Called,

True Copy of a Paper given into the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers, &c.

The Other,

he Pretended Yearly Meeting of the Quakers; their Nameless Bull of Excommunication, &c.

Both which BOOKS are herein

ANSWERED,

And his Malice, Injustice, and Folly

EXPOSED.

By *THOMAS ELLWOOD.*

ts 20.30. *Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.*
John 2.19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.*

ndon. Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, near the the Meeting-House in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious Street*. 1695.

A. S. Tober,
June 12, 1916
$6.00

Truth Defended

AND THE

Friends thereof Cleared,

FROM THE

alſe Charges, Foul Reproaches, and Envious Cavils, caſt upon It and Them, by

George Keith, &c.

IT is an old Obſervation, That none prove more angry and *implacable* Enemies to any Society of People, than they that, for their orders and unruly Behaviour, have been diſ-ned by the Society they once were of; a cer-n Vindictive Enmity uſually getting up in h, and ſtirring them up to load that Society, which they were denied, with all the Re-ach and Infamy they can: Thereby both

gratifying a *revengeful* ſpirit in themſelves, and thinking alſo, by criminating others, to extenuate at leaſt their own Crimes. That thus it was in the early times of Chriſtianity, may be gathered from the Writings of the Apoſtles, particularly 2 *Tim.*4 14. 2 *Pet.* 2. 1 *John* 2. 18, &c. 3 *John* 9, &c. *Jude* verſ.4. Among thoſe in this Age, whom Satan has drawn to this degree of Malice and Madneſs, *George Keith*, a Scotchman, is the lateſt, but not the leaſt, whether with reſpect to his Anger, or his Envy. He, having been bred a Scholar, before he came amongſt the People called *Quakers*, and having acquired more of School-Learning than moſt (it may be, in his own Opinion, than any) of that People have, hath given, in himſelf, a demonſtrative proof of the Apoſtles Propoſition (1 *Cor.*8.1.) *Knowledge puffeth up*, where *edifying Charity* is not joyned with it. For humane Knowledge is apt of it ſelf to *lift up* mens minds, that have, or think they have it, in any degree of Eminency; and makes them think better of themſelves, then of others, or then themſelves deſerve: whereas true Charity uſeth knowledge to Inſtruct, and thereby *build up*; not to Puzzle, and Confound, and thereby *deſtroy*, Others. But that Charity this man not having, but being *vainly puffed up in his fleſhly mind*, from a proud conceit of his own Abilities; and being gotten into *America* (among a Plain People, who better underſtood the Plain and Simple Truth, than the Nice Diſtinctions and Subtilties of the Schools) and there advanced to the Office of a School-maſter, with a ſtanding Sallary

Sallary (as I have been informed) of an Hundred and Twenty Pounds by the year, he ſoon began, like *Diotrephes* of old (3 *John* 9. 10.) to Affect *Pre-eminence* in the Church; and nothing leſs would ſerve his turn, then to Rule, and Over-rule all. And that he might not want matter to work upon, and ſome pretence to begin on, he not only found fault with Friends Miniſtry, and Diſcipline there; but having, in private Diſcourſes, put ſome Captious and Enſnaring Queſtions to ſome particular Perſons there, whoſe Simplicity he thought he might moſt eaſily betray, he (by wreſting their Anſwers to a wrong ſence) took advantage to complain againſt them, for holding, as he ſaid, Groſs and Vile Errors: and with Impetuous Heat, proſecuting his Charge, and not being ſo fully, nor ſpeedily Anſwered, as he expected; by thoſe Friends to whom he complained, who ſeeing the Innocency of the Accuſed, and his evil deſign in Accuſing, could not Countenance him therein, he Involved them alſo in the like charge of Cloaking, or Covering Groſs and Vile Errors, Damnable Hereſies, and Doctrines of Devils, *&c.* Nor gave he over, till by continual Clamours, and frequent Diſturbances, he had filled Friends Meetings with Strife and Contention; and at length, having *levened a Party* to himſelf, made an open *Diviſion* and Separation from Friends, ſetting up *Separate* Meetings for himſelf and his Party, in *oppoſition* to the Meetings of Friends before Setled there. And having got the Printer to his Party, and thereby the only Preſs there at

his command) he maliciously put the difference into Print, and thereby spread it, not only in those parts of *America*, but these of *Europe* also. These things drew the Friends there, after much Patience and long Forbearance, to deal with him in a Church-way, and give forth at length a Testimony against him; Which proving uneasie to him, he came over from thence to *England*, about the beginning of the year 1694; of which some Friends of *Pensilvania* having notice, came over also; and at the Yearly meeting of the People called Quakers, holden at *London*, in the Fourth Month that Year, the Matters relating to that Difference being fully heard and considered, the sence of that Meeting was, That the *Separation lay at* G. K.'s *Door*, and *that he had done ill*, in Printing and Publishing those Differences, as he had done. And the Advice of the Meeting to him thereupon, was, to *call in those Books* of his, or publish something innocently, and effectually to clear the Body of the People called Quakers, and their Ministers, from those gross Errors charged on some few in *America*; and retract the bitter Language in them, so far as he was concerned: and sincerely to use his utmost Endeavours with his Friends concerned, to remove the Separation, *&c.* Which Sense and Advice, being drawn up at large in Writing, was then, in that Meeting, delivered to him, and soon after printed by one of his Party, with very envious Reflections upon it, as may be seen in a small Pamphlet, called *A true Account*, &c. to which I refer. But so far was *G. K.* from regarding the Sense, or following

lowing the Advice of that Yearly Meeting, that in ſeveral printed Books, by him ſoon after publiſhed, he rejected it, denying it to be the Senſe or Advice of the Yearly Meeting, or that to be the Yearly Meeting which gave it. Which *Abuſe*, this laſt Yearly Meeting (in the Third Month paſt) taking notice of, and upon further Dealing with him, finding him, inſtead of being humbled and ſorry for the Evil he had done, more *hardened* therein, juſtifying himſelf, both by word & writing, and rejecting the Meeting; that Meeting (after it had heard him patiently, till he of his own accord with-drew) gave forth a Teſtimony againſt him, which he hath ſince printed, with his Anſwer thereunto: As he hath alſo (in another Pamphlet) a Copy of his Paper which he read in the Meeting; together with a Narrative (of his making) of the Proceedings of the Meeting with him, and a Liſt of Errors charged by him on ſome particular Perſons. To each of theſe I intend to ſpeak, now that I have premiſed this ſhort Introduction; which I thought needful for the Information of any ſuch Reader as had not before heard the Riſe of the Difference, nor the Courſe of Proceedings thereupon.

The firſt of his Pamphlets now under my conſideration, is that which he calls, *The true Copy of a Paper given into the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers*, &c. And the firſt Line of that Paper (next to the Title of it) contains a foul Falſhood: For he begins it thus, *I come here before you in a Spirit of Love*; Whereas the Paper it ſelf (which he then brought, and read)

plainly ſhews, he came in a Spirit of Wrath, Envy, Contention and Deceit, as by the Parts thereof, herein recited and anſwered, will appear.

His Paper is caſt into divers Heads; the Firſt and Second of which contain particular Complaints againſt particular Perſons, for Writing and Printing, or Speaking in publick againſt him. To which I intend to Anſwer particularly; but not till I have ſpoken to his Third Head, which ſhould in right have been the Firſt; but he has Craftily poſt-poned it, and made it his Third.

In this Third Head, p. 4. he takes hold of a paſſage towards the Cloſe of that Paper, which was given him in the Yearly Meeting, 1694. wherein, he ſays, that Meeting gave it as their Advice, that *Friends ſhould be tender and kind to him, as he ſhould approve himſelf to be a Man of Peace and Charity towards all, and anſwer their Chriſtian Advice therein; and to avoid all publick and apparent Reflections on both ſides.* Upon this he writes thus, *Now that it may appear ye are for doing Juſtice impartially, let it be impartially examined by you, as well whether they on the one ſide have not kept to that Advice given in that Paper, as whether I have kept to it on the other ſide; and let it be duly weighed in the Balance of Truth, which of us are more or leſs guilty, or whether they or I be moſt, or altogether Innocent.* To which I Anſwer, That Meeting, though ſenſible and fully ſatisfied, that *George Keith* was wrong, and gone

out

out from Friends, yet was desirous that (if possible) he might have returned, and not have been utterly lost; and for that Reason expreſt their deſire in that Paper, that as *G. K.* ſhould approve himſelf in Charity and Reconciliation with Friends and Brethren in *London*, and elſewhere, (which Clauſe he left out in reciting the words) they are deſired accordingly to be tender and kind to him, as he ſhould ſincerely approve himſelf to be a Man of Peace and Charity towards all, and ſhould anſwer the Chriſtian Advice of the Meeting therein, that is, in that Paper. So that the Advice to Friends to be tender and kind to him, depended on a *Twofold Condition* to be performed by him: The one more general, the other more particular. In general, *That he ſhould approve himſelf in Charity and Reconciliation with Friends, and to be a Man of Peace and Charity towards all, and that ſincerely.* This plainly ſpeaks that he was even then, and in the Judgment of that Meeting, out of Peace and Charity, and unreconciled to Friends. The more particular Condition, *That he ſhould anſwer the Chriſtian Advice of that Meeting, given him in that Paper*; which was, *That he ſhould either call in thoſe Books of his, by which he had expoſed the Differences in Print to the World, to the view of our Enemies both in* America *and* Europe (which had been of great diſſervice to the Truth, *&c.*) *or, at leaſt ſhould publiſh ſomething innocently and effectually, to clear the Body of the People called Quakers, and their Miniſters, from thoſe groſs Errors charged on ſome few in* America, *and retract the bitter Language in them, ſo far as*

he

he is concerned. And that *he ought now to use his utmost endeavours with his Friends concerned, to remove the Separation in* America (which was declared to lye at his Door) *and to help forward a re-uniting, &c.* as may be seen in their Pamphlet, called, *A True Account*, &c. *p.* 4, 5.

Here is both the Advice or Desire of the Meeting, that Friends would be Tender and Kind to *G. K.* and the Conditions to be performed by him, on the performance whereof, that Advice or Desire, (of being Tender and Kind to him) depended. The next thing in Course to be inquired, was, whether he performed these Conditions, or not? This the last Yearly Meeting inquired, and found he had not. And indeed, so far was he from endeavouring to approve himself in Charity, Reconciliation and Peace, and from calling-in those Books of his, or writing any thing for the clearing of Friends, or endeavouring to remove the Separation in *America:* That he acted contrary in every particular. For it was not many days after the Meeting was ended, but a Copy of that Paper, which was given him by the Meeting, was (with his, at least, privity) published in Print, by one of his Party (who came out of *America* with him) with a most Scandalous Preface before it, and Queries of like import behind, carrying apparent and foul Reflections upon the Meeting that gave it forth. And quickly after that, came forth in Print another Book, with *George Keith* to it, called, *The Causless Ground of Surmises*, &c. *removed*, levelled also (though more covertly) against the Yearly Meeting,

Meeting, and containing many ſlighting and ſcornful Reflections upon the Advice given him by that Meeting. And finally, in that, and ſome other ſubſequent Books of his, he rejected the ſenſe and advice given him, as not coming from the Yearly Meeting; and diſowned the Meeting it ſelf to be a Yearly Meeting, or any Meeting duly and regularly Conſtituted, calling it a Party, or Faction. Thus, inſtead of calling in his former ſcandalous Books, he publiſhed new ones. Inſtead of clearing the Body of the People called Quakers from thoſe groſs Errors he had Charged on ſome Particulars in *America*, he, by ſly Inſinuations, ſpread his falſe Charges further. Inſtead of endeavouring to remove the Separation he had made in *America*, he, by Letters to his Party there (as I have been informed) endeavoured to confirm and ſtrengthen them therein. Inſtead of approving himſelf in Charity, Reconciliation and Peace, he proved himſelf, by his unruly and turbulent Behaviour, both in Meetings and out, to be in a Spirit of Enmity, more irreconciled to Friends, and ſeeking and catching all Occaſions to make War, and give Diſturbance. Yet would he lay claim to the Benefit of the advice of the Meeting to Friends, to be tender and kind to him, though *he hath broken all the Conditions*, upon which that advice was grounded. Can any thing be more Unreaſonable! Nay, is it not an Argument of great Inſincerity in him, to claim the Benefit of the Advice of that Yearly Meeting, and yet at the ſame time deny it to be the Yearly Meeting, and call it a Party or Faction?

Faction? By this time, I ſuppoſe, the Reader may apprehend the Reaſon, why I anſwered this Third Head before the Firſt and Second. For they containing Complaints againſt Particular Perſons, for writing, or ſpeaking publickly againſt him, it was neceſſary, that which he makes his Third Head ſhould be firſt Anſwered, that thereby his ſtate being rightly opened, and the terms he ſtood upon towards Friends, and Friends towards him, plainly diſcovered, it might appear upon what juſt and reaſonable Grounds he was oppoſed, or teſtified againſt, by them he complains of in his firſt and ſecond Head.

I come now to the Firſt Head in his Paper, which contains, in the firſt place, a Complaint againſt me, for *defaming him*, (as he ſays) *and groſly, and unchriſtianly repreſenting him in ſome late printed Books.* To which I anſwer; Firſt, I have not miſrepreſented him. And if to repreſent him as he is, be to defame him, it is his own fault; I cannot help it. Secondly, in what I have written, relating to him, I have been but on the *defenſive* part, (as I am now) he was the Aggreſſor. For ſoon after the Yearly Meeting in 1694. he, and his Friend *R. Hannay*, publiſhed two very defaming Pamphlets (as is briefly hinted before) againſt that Meeting. I, in an Epiſtle directed to Friends, *wiped off the Dirt* thrown upon the Meeting. and manifeſted his Inſincerity and Deceit. Netled therewith, he ſent forth a Printed Sheet, which he miſcalled, *A Loving Epiſtle*; in which (with Lan-

Language far enough from being Loving or Chriſtian) he charged me by the Lump, with Fifty Perverſions, Forgeries, and falſe Accuſations, without naming one. And ſome time after, he ſent forth a larger Book, (which he called, *A Seaſonable Information and Caveat*, &c.) wherein he *retailed* his Fifty Charges againſt me, which he had before expoſed by *wholeſale*: To thoſe two Books I replied in another Epiſtolary Treatiſe, (called, *A further Diſcovery of that Spirit of Contention and Diviſion, which hath appeared of late in* G. Keith, *&c.*) wherein I vindicated my ſelf from his Fifty Charges, and laid the Forgeries, Perverſions, and falſe Accuſations upon his own Head, where he hath thought fit to let them lye, rather than attempt to caſt them off. Surely, if I have *defamed* him (as he ſays I have) in Print, it had better becom'd him, to have *famed* himſelf again in Print, than lye under the defamation five or ſix Months, to complain of me to a Yearly Meeting. But how ridiculouſly idle is it in him, to complain to that Meeting againſt me, for defending that Meeting againſt him!

His Complaint againſt *John Penington* is a like unreaſonable; for what he Printed was chiefly ſome *Certificates* received from *America*, in *Vindication* of *Samuel Jennings* (a Friend that lives there) whom *G. K.* had notoriouſly *abuſed* in Print, after *S. J.* was gone for *Penſylvania*, and could not make his own Defence. And this too was after *G. K.* had in Print *rejected the Advice of the Yearly Meeting*, and given unqueſtionable Proofs, that he was not a Friend, but

an Enemy. This alſo juſtifies thoſe other Friends (*D. Wharley* and *W. Penn*) whom in his Second Head he complains of, for interrupting him, in that which he calls his publick Teſtimony, in ſeveral Meetings. For when a Perſon ſhall have ſo far *diſ-joined* himſelf, from the Society he was once of, as to act the part of an *open Enemy*, not only endeavouring, to his utmoſt power, to break, diſturb, and (if poſſible) to overturn the Peace, Quiet and Concord of the Society; but ſhall reject, and trample on the Authority of the Society, and expoſe, in the moſt reproachful manner, not only the Profeſſors, but the Profeſſion it ſelf, to the Contempt and Scorn of the World: And ſhall alſo have *joined himſelf to another Society*, as this Man hath done (who hath joined himſelf to another People (if they deſerve to be called a People) who upon another ſort of humorous Diſcontent, have *diſ-joined* themſelves from us and our Society ſome Years ago, and ſet up, and continue up, ſeparate Meetings for themſelves, in oppoſition to ours) what colour or pretence, I wonder, of Reaſon, can ſuch a Perſon have, to expect a liberty to preach, undenied, in any of the Meetings of that Society, which he ſo departed from, and which he hath treated ſo ill? Nothing, I think, can excuſe the Confidence and Preſumption of ſuch a Perſon, unleſs it be a favourable Suppoſition, that he is *delirious*, and *non ſane mentis*. As for *W. P*'s calling *G. K.* an *Apoſtate*, I know not what *apter* word he could have expreſt himſelf by: Nor do I think any Conſiderate Perſon, that ſhall read *G. K*'s own

Books,

Books, and underſtand his Carriage at that Meeting, will think him wronged by that Term.

His Fourth Complaint is againſt *W. Bingley*, *J. Vaughton*, and others indefinitely, without Name, or Number. And theſe he Charges with endeavouring to hinder his Speaking in Meetings, and with ſpeaking cloſely one after another, and ſometimes making Signs, and pulling by the Coat to ſtand up and ſpeak, on purpoſe to prevent his ſpeaking: Theſe Charges are too general, to be true; too idle, to be regarded. Did all thoſe he mentions make ſigns, and pull by the Coat? Or but ſome? And if ſome, which? 'Tis a ſign his mind was not very well exerciſed, if he ſat watching what others did. But ſuppoſing (not granting) any one did pull another by the Coat, could there be no occaſion or reaſon for ſo doing, unleſs it were to excite him to ſpeak? It is common, (he knows) in ſuch great Aſſemblies, for one to pull another by the Coat, to offer him the Conveniency of a Seat to reſt himſelf, when (the number of Perſons exceeding the number of Seats) they are fain to ſit and ſtand by turns. If therefore one did pull another by the Coat, how knows he, that it was done to have that other ſpeak? And that too on purpoſe to prevent his ſpeaking? Did any of them tell him ſo? Did he hear them ſay ſo? What proof has he of the Intention, who gives no Proof of the Fact? He has decry'd inward ſenſe and diſcerning, in the ſame place where he makes this Charge;

Charge; ſaying, p. 4. Whatever pretences ſome make to judge me to be wrong, and of a wrong Spirit, from their inward ſenſe and diſcerning, without outward proof and evidence in matter of Fact againſt me, will bear weight with none of a ſound Judgment; no more then will this Charge of his, without proof. He ſays they did it manifeſtly, and to the Obſervation of the Meeting. But it is manifeſt to every ones Obſervation, that he ſpeaks at random: For if the matter of Fact, that one had pulled another by the Coat, had been manifeſt to the Obſervation of the Meeting; yet could the Intention of the Party therein be manifeſt, to the Obſervation of the Meeting, *viz.* that it was done to cauſe the other to ſpeak, and that on purpoſe to prevent *G. K*'s ſpeaking? But if any had endeavoured to hinder his Preaching in Friends Meetings, (how blameable ſoever ſuch might have been, if they had done it by undue means) yet they had done no wrong therein to him, who, ſince he turned from being a Friend, to be an Enemy, had no right, nor colour of right, to Preach there. And therefore if *W. B.* or *S. W.* did break up a Meeting (as he ſays they did) before its uſual time, (which never had, nor ſhould have any certain, ſet, fixed, limited time to break up at) or, if *W. B.* or any other Friend, when *G. K.* began to ſpeak, after the Meeting was broken up, did deſire Friends to paſs away, (which is another Limb of *G. K*'s Charge they therein gave a ſeaſonable Teſtimony to the People, that *G. K.* was none of us, but an intruding Adverſary, whom none,

none, I think, in their right Wits, could think the Meeting under an Obligation to ſtay to hear. Nor had the Yearly Meeting any reaſon to take notice of theſe Complaints of *G. K*'s, ſeeing he had long before rejected the Advice of the Meeting to him, and denied the Meeting it ſelf.

In his Fifth Head he alledges, that it is ſaid by ſome, and particularly by *Jo. Vaughton* and *Jo. Field*, that *thoſe who denied him in* Penſylvania, *their denying him, and diſowing his Miniſtry, was enough for Friends to deny him here, &c.* Upon this he puts ſeveral Queſtions thus, *Now if this be ſo* (ſays he) *and that it be your Senſe, how is it that it was not expreſſed in that Paper, called, A true Account, given out at the laſt Yearly Meeting?* Anſwer, The laſt Yearly Meeting dealt more *gently* with him than he deſerved, being deſirous to have reclaimed him, if it might have been; and in order thereunto did, in that Paper then given him, propoſe ſeveral things, as the Senſe and Advice, or Judgment of that Meeting, for him to do: Which had he, with a right Mind, received and obſerved, he might have been reſtored, and reconciled to Friends here, and there alſo. And that Meeting being thus tenderly diſpoſed towards him, did forbear to expreſs in that Paper, their Senſe of the validity and force of the Judgment given againſt him by the Friends in *Penſylvania*; which, had he ſincerely repented and returned, the Friends there, (I doubt not) would have been more forward to have taken off, than they were to lay it upon him. But he not repenting of the

Evil he had done, but perſiſting and *hardening himſelf* therein, and rejecting the Advice and Senſe of the former Yearly Meeting to him, has drawn the Judgment of the laſt Yearly Meeting alſo upon him; of both which he may one day feel the weight. He asks alſo, *How it is, that Friends generally joined with him in Prayer, about the time of the laſt Yearly Meeting, (viz.* in 1694.) *and were uncovered when he prayed?* I Anſwer, he infers their joining with him in Prayer, from their being uncover'd when he prayed; but that was *not intentional*, nor voluntary in them; but *accidental*, as to them, however *craftily deſigned* by him. The occaſion and manner thereof was thus; A Day or two before that Yearly Meeting began, ſome Friends had a deſire to have a Meeting in private with *G. K.* that they might ſit down together in a weighty retirement of Spirit to the Lord, to feel the ſtirrings of the Divine Power, and the Ariſings of the Heavenly Life, and antient Love amongſt them, that therein they might Travail in Spirit for him, and hold forth a friendly Hand of Love to him, to draw him (if poſſible) out of the Snare of the Wicked One, in which they were ſenſible he was entangled and held. And having ſignified their deſire to him, accordingly they met; but could not have ſuch a Meeting as they deſired, by reaſon that he (*whoſe Life lay in Contention and Debate*) brake often in upon them with *wrangling* Diſcourſes, which they, mindful of the end of their Meeting, endeavoured to avoid, but in vain. Before that Meeting ended, a Friend kneeled down to Prayer, with whom

whom the reſt joined, which occaſioned the whole Meeting to be uncovered. No ſooner had that Friend done, but *G. K.* began, and that ſo *cloſely*, that without an indecent and hurrying haſte, the Friends could not have been covered when he began. So that it is true indeed in Fact, that they were uncovered *when* he prayed; not that they were uncovered *becauſe* he prayed, as thereby joining with him in his Prayer. See now what Tricks, Devices and Fetches he has, and what weak Props he Builds upon. Which brings to my remembrance a Saying he uſed afterwards in the Yearly Meeting, when ſome took notice of his inſiſting on things of little or no Moment, *viz.* That *his Caſe was like that of a drowning or ſinking Man, to whom it is natural to catch hold of any thing, though but the leaſt Twig or Ruſh, to hang by.*

He mentions here again the Meetings recommending to Friends to be tender and kind to him, and to avoid all publick and apparent Reflections on both ſides. From which he infers, *If it had been their Judgment that he ought not to ſpeak in Meetings, it had been improper to adviſe him to avoid all publick and apparent Reflections*, &c. I noted before, that this Advice to Friends to be tender and kind to him, *&c.* was *under the Conditions* of his approving himſelf in Charity and Reconciliation with Friends, a Man of Peace, *&c.* and his anſwering the Chriſtian Advice of that Meeting to him; which had he done, there might have been room for him to have ſpoken in Meetings, without occaſion of

reflecting, or being reflected on. And while he ſtood upon probation, it was a neceſſary Caution, that if he would Preach (which, his Opinion of himſelf, and Natural Propenſity to *Talkativeneſs*, conſidered it was not likely he would forbear) he ſhould do it without Reflection, and Friends would bear with him. In which it is evident, the Meeting *condeſcended* much farther than he deſerved, out of an earneſt deſire that he might not have been utterly loſt. But if he ſhould reject the Senſe and Advice of the Meeting, and run further from Charity, Reconciliation and Peace, (which he ſoon did) it cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to be the Judgment of that Meeting, that he had right, or ought to have liberty, to Preach in Friends Meetings.

His Sixth Head is a Complex, or Miſcellany of many things jumbled together not very agreeably. Firſt, he takes for granted, that *divers owned by the Meeting, as Members of their Society, both in City and Country, do ſtill own him, as a Friend of Truth, and his Miniſtry and Teſtimony*, (wherein I think he rather ſpeaks what he wiſhes, than what he knows, or has ground to believe) *Others*, he ſays, *diſown him, and a third ſort are in ſuſpence*, &c. Thence he deſires the Meeting *to be plain and expreſs, in giving their unanimous Senſe and Judgment concerning him, either to own or diſown him*, (it ſeems not much matter to him which) then he takes upon him to direct the Meeting thus, *What Paper ye give out concerning me, let it be ſigned with all your hands*

that

that give Judgment in the Case, and not laid on the Clark, that it may appear all present are unanimous in the said Judgment. Next, he objects against the Meeting's Power to *give out any Paper against him, for any New Matter since the last Yearly Meeting, until,* &c. After that, he excepts against such indefinitely, as (he says) *have sufficiently discovered themselves to be prejudiced against him,* &c. Then he excepts against the Meeting in general. And lastly, against half a dozen Friends by Name. To all which, I think, there needs no distinct Answer; nor other Observation upon it than this, (which is obvious to every Eye) that the design of that whole Paper of his was, by multiplying Complaints and Exceptions, to clog the Meeting so, that it might not proceed at all, to give Judgment against him: For if the Meeting had undertaken to hear all his Complaints (which did not properly lye before that Meeting) instead of being a Yearly Meeting, it might have been a Years Meeting, or of a Years Continuance. If the Meeting would have admitted all his groundless Exceptions, there would have been few, if any, left to make a Meeting. And when all had been done, his Exception against the Constitution of the Meeting, would have made void whatsoever had been done or concluded by the Meeting, (had that been allowed) for that was destructive of the Power, and very Being of the Meeting.

His Seventh Head desires, That *what Sentence should be passed concerning him, might be made publick, and he have a true Copy of it, with*

the particular Reasons of the Censure, &c. A Sentence and Censure then, it seems, he expected, (as he knew he deserved it) and in that, I think, he was rightly answered, the Judgment of the Meeting concerning him, being made publick, in the first place to him, by sending the first Copy thereof to his House for him: Which he having made more publick in Print, the Reader may satisfie himself thereby of the particular Reasons it is grounded upon.

In his Eighth and last Head he desires to know *what the Meeting means by the Body of the People called Quakers*. So long as he continued a Member of the Body, he understood what was meant by the Body; and he required no Explanation of the Term then: But now, being gone from the Body, and having dis-jointed himself from any Membership therein, he pretends not to understand what is meant by the word Body, that he may get fresh Occasion to Cavil, and make himself more Work. But since, in his following *Narrative*, in p. 12. of the same Pamphlet, he acknowledges *G. W.* told him, in the Meeting, what was meant by the Body; I think it needless to say more of it here, especially since it is a word common to all Societies, Religious and Civil.

Having passed through the several Heads of his Paper, I come now to the *Narrative* he has given *of the most material passages* (he says) *of Discourse betwixt several Friends and him in the Meeting*; which how fair and exact it is, the

Reader

Reader may guess, being *written by himself*, a Party, *in his own Cause and Favour*; and after he was gone from the Meeting, by a dependance on his Memory (he not writing in the Meeting, nor any for him, that was observed).

He begins his Narrative, p. 8. with an Account of his Coming to the Meeting, Offering to enter, and being stopt, *&c.* which he doth by way of Reflection on the Meeting, as not fairly held, because the Door was not open to every Comer. How unfit and unreasonable that had been, shall be shewed anon, when I come to speak to his Answer to the Yearly Meetings Judgment concerning him. In the mean time, the Reader may take notice, that when he offered to enter the Meeting, and was stopt; they that stopt him, gave him a *Reason* why they stopt him. Thus he relates it; *I offering to enter, was stopt by the Keepers; I enquiring the Reason, they told me, I was not in Unity with Friends.* This was such a Reason, as, I think, every reasonable Man will think sufficient, on which to deny him entrance into that Meeting, as a Member of the Meeting, on which score he would have entred. Now mark his Reply; *I replied*, says he, *I know no Meeting as yet, in* England, *that hath disowned me.* He could not say indefinitely, he knew no Meeting that had disowned him; but no Meeting in *England.* He knew (and he knew they knew) he had been disowned by a Meeting in *Pensylvania*, yea, by *several* Meetings in *America*, before he came from thence: therefore he alledged he

knew no Meeting as yet, in *England*, that had disowned him. On the same foot, though he now knows that the Yearly Meeting in *England* has disowned him, he may yet go into *Ireland*, and there alledge, that he knows no Meeting in *Ireland*, that has disowned him as yet. But that would not bear him off there; nor yet, I suppose, in his own Nation of *Scotland*, should he attempt it. Besides, if he knew no Meeting in *England* that had disowned him; yet he knew he had disowned several Meetings of Friends in *England*, and those none of the least, even the Second Days Morning Meeting, consisting of Ministring Friends, and the Yearly Meeting, comprehending the Faithful Friends of *England* and *Wales*: And that those Friends, who stopt him at the Meeting Door, knew also; which was sufficient ground for them to tell him, he was not in Unity with Friends. Yet, from his own Relation, it appears, They were *civil* and *courteous* to him; for he says, *One of them proffered to go in, and acquaint the Meeting, that he desired to have entrance*; and did so. Nor did the Meeting return a bare and blunt denial, by the same Person that acquainted them with his desire, but sent him their Answer by some Members of the Meeting, and that quickly. For (says he) *a little after some came out and told me, I was not to have entrance; but if I had any Paper, they would carry it to the Meeting.* Very reasonable and justifiable was this, on the Meetings part, as not to admit him, *as one in Unity with Friends*, (on which account he prest to come in) so neither to reject

ject what he had to offer, if he had any thing committed to Writing. But he was *peremptory*, and (as himself says) told them that brought him the Message, *He had a Paper, but not having a Copy of it, would not give it out of his Hand; and though he had another Copy, yet he was resolved to give no Paper to them, to be read in their Meeting, unless he were present.* Such an *heady* and *surly Resolution*, might perhaps have justified the Meeting, if they had refused to hear both his Paper and him. But the Meeting *condescended*, and he acknowledges that *that Evening two of the Meeting came to his House, and told him, The Yearly Meeting agreed he should come next day, about the sixth Hour in the Evening, and have entrance to read his Paper, or hear it read, provided he would withdraw when desired.* This Proviso was very needful; for in the Meeting the Year before, he was very *unruly* and disorderly; sometimes *refusing to withdraw*, when the Meeting desired him, and at one time positively declaring, *He would not go out, unless he were carried out by force.* And at another time, in that Yearly Meeting, desiring that he might but look into a Paper (which had been then read concerning him) on pretence to satisfie himself of some passage in it, and it being handed to him for that end; he not only refused to deliver it back again, after he had looked into it, but put it up into his Pocket, saying, *He would not part with it, unless it were taken from him by violence:* (Though, through much importunity, he was at length prevailed with to return it). So that, from the Experience the Meeting

ing had of his unruly Carriage the Year before; they had good Cauſe to provide now for his withdrawing at their deſire, before they admitted him in; for which yet they required no other than his own Promiſe. Now I appeal to any conſiderate and indifferent Reader, whether, according to *G. K*'s own Relation hitherto, the Meeting did not deal better with him, than he deſerved from them.

He goes on to relate his Coming in, and the Poſture he found the Meeting in, in deſcribing which he is rather *ſcenical* than *ſerious*, and bewrays at once both his *Envy* and his *Folly*. He ſays, *At the time appointed I came in, and was allowed to ſit at the great ſquare Table, among the Miniſters and Commiſſioners, that can hold about it, either fully, or near double, to the number* 24, *whether by Alluſion to the* 24 *Seats and Elders mentioned*, Rev. 4. *but doubling the numbers, I do not determine*, &c. His thus particularly noting the *Faſhion* and *Size* of the Table, denotes in him a Diſpoſition to *Cavil* at any thing, how inoffenſive ſoever. In ſuch an Aſſembly, where occaſions occur for both Reading and Writing, that a Table is uſeful and needful, no Man, I think, that is not as *ſenſeleſs* as a Table, will deny. What Figure, or Faſhion, ſuch a Table ſhould be of, whether Square, Round, Long or Oval, Sexangular, or Octangular) or of what Size, is too impertinent and immaterial, for any, but a *meer Caviller*, to Quarrel about.

His Inſinuating an *Alluſion* in that Table, and thoſe that ſate about it, to the 24 Seats and Elders

Elders mentioned, *Rev.* 4. shews an *envious* and *scoffing* Mind in him, as well as Folly, and want of Consideration, in grounding his Imagined Allusion upon the Number which may sit about that Table, which he says is fully, or near double the number 24; so that according to him, a Table, with 48 Persons about it, may be an Allusion to the 24 Seats and Elders in *Rev.* 4. This shews he was under an *Illusion*, when he made his Ridiculous *Allusion*.

He goes on thus, *I think it suits not with their crying out so much, as they were wont, against Chief Seats in the Synagogues, to* Erect *such a stately* Fabrick *in their Meeting-house at that time, it little differing from the manner of a* Throne, *but that it is* low *upon the Floor, covered with Green Cloth, &c.* With what a *Pomp* of words has this *idle* Man cloathed his *empty* Matter, to amuse an *unwary* Reader, as if indeed some *stately Fabrick* had been really Erected in the Meeting-house, in manner of a Throne! When as indeed, when all comes to all, 'tis nothing else but a Table *of common height*, covered with a piece of Green Bays, and standing on the Floor. By what *Scotch-figure* he calls a *Table* a stately *Fabrick*, (which signifies a *Building*) and says, It is Erected (that is, raised, let, or lifted up, and advanced) and little differing from the manner of a Throne, and yet confesses, it is low, upon the Floor, I know not. But this I know, that this is a *shameful stumble* for a Wise Man, and such a Scholar to make. What greater *Blunder* could the greatest *Dunce* have made? But it is just with God, to confound the Wis-

dom

dom of the Wise, when, with their Wisdom, they set themselves to Fight against his Truth and People, as this Man hath done.

In his comparing the Table to a *Throne*, he also shews an evil Mind, as if he would have it believed, that some Body sate upon the Table; for Thrones are set up, and raised on purpose for some Prince, or great Personage to sit upon. But that Table had only Persons sitting about it on Forms, and that without any difference of Place. For his saying, *Few take liberty to sit there, but the Chiefest in respect among them*, implies that liberty is *not denied to any*. All have that liberty, but few (he says) take it. This shews a modest and humble Mind in such, as so *prefer others before themselves*, agreeable to that good Exhortation of the Apostle, *Phil.* 2. 3. *In lowliness of mind, let each esteem others better than himself*; which I suppose is not *G. K*'s Practice. And that to sit at that Table, was not appropriated to such only, as he calls the *Chiefest in respect*, may appear by his saying, That *He was allowed to sit at it*. And when all is said, that Table is no other, either for Fashion, Size, or Standing, than it was the Year before, when he sate at it, without shewing any dislike to it; as it is probable he would not now have done, had not the Judgment of the Meeting been given forth against him.

He goes on to set forth his proposing the Reading of his Paper, and what *G. W.* said thereupon to him; wherein, though he hath not fairly and fully given *G. W.*'s words; yet he hath given more of them than he knows how

to

to answer: And being a man void of sincerity, (one that says, and writes, what he thinks will help his Cause, without regard to speaking Truth) he often *interferes* with himself, and and bewrays his own *Falshood*; as he doth even here. For having reported *G. W.* to have said to him, That *he Printed a Paper reflecting on the Yearly Meeting the last Year; and though he mentioned not the Yearly Meeting in that Paper, called, The Causeless ground, yet it is apparent he meant them, for he recites some of their words*, &c. He says he replied to this thus, page 9. *As in that Paper I mentioned not the Yearly Meeting, so there were no words in that Paper* Answered *by me, but were spoken by other Persons before and after the Yearly Meeting; therefore ye cannot prove that I reflected on the Yearly Meeting. Besides*, adds he, *I do not own, that that Paper, called, A true Account of the Proceedings*, &c. *was the Yearly Meetings Act, but of a prevailing Party or Faction in it.* Observe now, here was a two-fold *Dodge*: he had his divers *Meuses*, or starting-holes, that if he missed one, he might escape through the other. First he says there are no words in that Paper *Answered* by him, (which was the Yearly Meetings Paper, called, *A true Account*, &c.) but were spoken by other Persons before and after the Yearly Meeting: Therefore, says he, ye cannot prove that I reflected on the Yearly Meeting. As much as to say; Seeing the Words in the Yearly Meeting's Paper, which I recited and *Answered*, were spoken by others, as well as well as written by the Yearly Meeting, I might in my printed Paper, reflect on those other

Persons,

Persons, not on the yearly Meeting. There is one of his Meuses. Besides, says he, I do not own that that Paper called, *A true Account*, &c. (and *which I answered*) was the Yearly Meeting's Act, but of a prevailing Party or Faction in it: And therefore in reflecting upon those that gave forth that Paper, called, *A true Account*, &c. I did not reflect on the Yearly Meeting, but only on that Party or Faction that gave it forth. There is his t'other Meuse. And between these two, he thought to dodge, and *play with the Meeting*, as he pleased. But in these two latter Pamphlets of his, he has unawares *let fall his Visor*, and must now appear *bare-fac'd*. For in the first of these Pamphlets, called *A true Copy*, &c. page 9. he hath spoil'd his first Meuse, by acknowledging that his printed Paper, called, *The Causeless Ground*, was written *in Answer* to that Paper, called, *A true Account of the Proceedings*, &c. which was given him in the Yearly Meeting. This acknowledgment of his is in these words, page 9. l. 16, &c. *As in that Printed Paper*, (to wit, his Book, called, *The Causeless Ground*) *I mentioned not the Yearly Meeting: so there are no words in that Paper* Answered by me, (to wit, the Yearly Meeting's Paper, called, *A true Account of the Proceedings*) *but were spoken by other Persons*, &c. Now he having thus owned his Book, called, *The Causeless Ground*, to be written in Answer to that Paper given him in the Yearly Meeting, (and called *A true Account*, &c.) Whatever Reflections are in that Book of his called, *The Causeless Ground*, upon any Words or Passages contained in that Paper called *A true*

Account,

Account, muſt be conſtrued to relate, and be intended by him to relate to thoſe Words and Paſſages, *as contained in that Paper*; not to the ſame or like words, as ſpoken by other perſons; becauſe that Book of his called, *The Cauſleſs Ground*, was (by this acknowledgment of his) written *in Anſwer* to that Paper, not to words ſpoken by other perſons. Thus he hath marr'd his firſt Meuſe. And although he alledges, that he doth not own that Paper called, *A true Account of the Proceedings*, &c. to be the Act of the Yearly Meeting: Yet inaſmuch as it was *delivered to him* in the Yearly Meeting, *as the Act* of the Yearly Meeting, and by him then *ſo Received*, whatever Reflections he hath ſince made upon any Words or Paſſages in that Paper, muſt be conſtrued to be, and to be intended by him, as Reflections upon that Yearly Meeting. And thus his other Meuſe is marred alſo. Beſides, in his laſt Pamphlet called, *The Nameleſs Bull*, (wherein he hath Printed this laſt Yearly Meetings Judgment againſt him, with his Anſwer thereunto) he ſays, p. 11. *Another great Cauſe of their paſſing this Unjuſt Sentence againſt me is, That I refuſed to call in the Book Printed ſince the laſt Yearly Meeting* (he means that in 1694.) Called, *The Cauſleſs Ground*; wherein (ſays he) *I Expoſtulate the Caſe; not only with reſpect to their too great Connivance of the Vile and Groſs Errors*, &c. *but*, &c. the word *THEIR* in this place muſt needs relate to the Yearly Meeting, mentioned juſt before, in Anſwer to whoſe Paper he writ his Book called, *The Cauſleſs Ground*; and in which he ſays, he Expoſtulates

the

the Case with respect to *their* too great Connivance of Vile and Gross Errors. This also shews that the Reflections in that Book (of which this, of Conniving at gross and vile Errors, was one, and oft repeated) was intended by him against that Yearly Meeting. And this further shews his *gross Hypocrisy* and *vile Deceit*, in Shifting, Shuffling, Dodging and Equivocating, as he hath done, to hide it.

Manifest also it is, that he *dissembled* with the last Yearly Meeting, concerning the Paper he then read, and hath since Printed. For when *G. W.* told him (as he reports the words, in p. 9. of his *True Copy*, &c.) *If thou hast any Paper to offer to this Yearly Meeting, to give Friends satisfaction, that thou wilt hearken to the Advise of the last Yearly Meeting, and disown what thou Printedst in that called*, The Causeless Ground, *reflecting on Friends*; *the Meeting will hear thy Paper*: he says, he replied, *As to my Paper giving satisfaction to the* Meeting, *I cannot say whether it will actually satisfy the Meeting*; *but I judge there is enough in it to be just Cause of Satisfaction to them.* The satisfaction mentioned by *G. W.* (and to which he answered) was, that he would *hearken to the Advice* of the Yearly Meeting before; and *disown what he had Printed* in that Book of his, called, *The Causeless Ground*, reflecting on Friends. But he knew there was nothing in that Paper, which he read in the Meeting, that could give any satisfaction in that respect; *nor did he intend it should.* And therefore in saying, as he did, that he could not say whether it would actually satisfie the Meeting

ing or no, but that he judged there was *enough in it* to be just cause of satisfaction to them, he answered very deceitfully and falsly.

In what he says of his Friend *Hanway*'s Paper, he falters, and halts downright. He says he *desired him he would not Print it*; which proves he was *privy* to the Printing of it: And it is evident, he must furnish him with the Copy, either directly or indirectly. He says again, as formerly, *He had no Hand in Printing it*. And he is angry with me, for construing his meaning thereby to be, that he did not work at the Press. This he calls one of my gross Perversions of his words; but doth not attempt to clear himself of it. In my Book, called, *A further Discovery, &c.* p. 20, 21, I gave sufficient Reasons for my putting that Construction on his words. And I noted there also, upon his saying he had *no Hand in the Printing it*, that he did not say he had *no Hand in the Writing* of it. Had he been clear, he had now a fair opportunity to have cleared himself, by declaring that he had *no Hand in the Writing*, Composing, Contriving, or Dictating that Paper, which goes (*in his style*) under *Hanway*'s Name. But I verily think he durst not say so: Not that I think he fears to speak falsly; for I am sensible he is too apt to that: But that he feared to be trapp'd, and discovered in a matter of Fact, to the utter ruin of his little Credit. And indeed, I am now more strongly perswaded, from the general Observation I have made, of the liberty he takes in Equivocating, and from his not offering to clear himself, from having had a Hand in

Writing, Composing, or Contriving it, that I *hit the mark* before; and that when he said he had *no Hand in the Printing it*, he meant, *he did not work at the Press.*

In the next place he falls *foully* and *rudely* upon an Ancient Friend, *Charles Marshall*, whom I suppose he will acknowledge to be his Elder, both in Profession of Truth, and Exercise of Ministry therein; him he brands for *one that abounds with his Prophesies and Predictions*; and adds, *But I know not if ever any of them came to pass*; *but surely, many have failed apparently.* Ay! what, *many* failed, and that *apparently* too, and yet name never an one? I think, in this he has apparently erred from both Christianity and Civility, and from his own Rule too, *viz.* That *nothing is more deceitful than bare Generals.* A Stranger may wonder what high provocation *C. M.* had given him, that should cause him to *fall so foul* upon him. Why, *C. M.* (he says) stood up, and said, *He had some few words of Exhortation to him from God.* Could one have thought this had been so great an Offence! Doubtless, had he been a Man of God, he would not have been so angry at a few words of Exhortation from God. They were called of old *Sons of Belial*, who would not bear the Yoke. What will he be called, who will *not bear the Word of Exhortation*, which the Author to the *Hebrews* beseeches the Saints to suffer? Chap. 13. 22. And *G. K.* himself, in his *Causless Ground*, p. 7. says, *Without Breach of Unity we ought to hear and receive the Word of Exhortation, or Reproof, that any have from the Spirit of Truth*

to

to deliver unto us, without Gainsaying, Strife, or Alienation of Mind. Besides, both the Matter and Style of the Exhortation given him, was so soft and inoffensive, that it could not have stirr'd so sharp and angry an Humour in any but a very *Cholerick*, or *Guilty* Man. For, as himself relates it, it was but thus, To exhort him *to come down to the Witness of God in his Heart, and return to that which convinced him at first, and gathered him out from among the Professors, and leave all these Imaginations, and bury them, and be reconciled to Friends.* Yet this *gentle* Exhortation, as gently delivered, could not pass then, without a *huffing* Reply; nor since, without *foul Reflections* on him that gave it. *He stood up*, he says, *to Reply; but there was great Opposition in Hearers to hinder him.* Pray, what was this great Opposition? Why, says he, *They said, There was no need of a Reply to a few words of Exhortation.* They that said so, no doubt, said right. But that would not stop him. He is one of them that, *like froward Children*, will and must be heard, or else the whole House shall be disturbed. And as he *loves to hear himself talk*; so he is ready at feigning Occasions for it. Although therefore there was no need of a Reply to the others Exhortation: Yet, *I hope* (says he) *I may have the like liberty to exhort him, as he had to exhort me.* And under that pretence falling on, instead of exhorting, he charges *C. M.* (p. 10.) with *having poured out many Curses and false Prophesies against him in divers publick Meetings, since the last Yearly Meeting, as* (says he) *is known to many.* This is a common thing with

him, to let fly a *general* Charge, and for proof only say, *It is known to many.* But as this is *unjuſt in him*; ſo (in this Caſe) it is *idle in it ſelf*: For if Curſes or Propheſies had been uttered in publick Meetings, how ſhould it be known to many, that they were ſpoken *againſt him*, unleſs they had been directed, or applied to him by Name? And how ſhould many, or he either, know ſuch Propheſies were falſe, unleſs their Accompliſhment was reſtrained to a *certain time*, and that time *expired*; neither of which I ſuppoſe, *G. K.* dares affirm. I ſhould not have taken ſuch particular notice of this Paragraph of his, but that I obſerved how much it tends to diſcover the *virulency* of his Nature, and his *intractable* Temper, not to be handled in any ſort, though never ſo gently, without danger to him that attempts it; in that, reſembling that ſort of Animal, which, at the approach of Man, circumvolving it ſelf, erects on every ſide ſuch ſharp and *prickly Briſtles*, as render it unſafe for Humane Hands, unleſs well guarded, to touch it.

Here *G. K.* ends his Narrative of the Firſt Days proceeding; and then begins to relate what Diſcourſe paſſed in the Meeting, between ſome Friends and him, the next day. He ſays *G. W. began, and made a long Speech*; but when himſelf began, he made a *much longer*; his Anſwer taking up more than double the room, in his own Book, that *G. W.*'s Speech doth. He ſays, he *replied in great Coolneſs*; but as they who were preſent know the contrary, ſo any that ſhall read his Reply, in his own Book, may find

find it came from an *heated* Spirit, and in an angry waſpiſh ſtyle. And indeed, though on the Firſt Day (to give him his utmoſt due) he kept his Paſſion within tolerable Bounds: Yet on the next day he *let it looſe* to a degree (I thought) *near Raving*; and the Account himſelf gives of what he ſaid that Day, hath more of *Railing* than *Reaſon* in it; for which Reaſon I ſhall take the leſs notice of it. He complains of the length of *G. W*'s Diſcourſe, and that *he could not remember all the Particulars.* But if his Memory was ſo ſhort and weak, as not to remember what had been ſpoken, in the *ſame moment* (as it were) wherein it was ſpoken; how durſt he rely upon ſuch a Memory, for compiling a Narrative afterwards, of what had been ſaid in the Meeting that Day, both by himſelf and others, with which he has filled well near ſix Pages. What Credit can a Conſiderate Reader give to ſuch a Narrative!

He denies that he hath as yet judged all Friends. And he might as well deny that he hath judged any; none being owned by him to be Friends, but ſuch as he think join and ſide with him. He has not indeed judged his Friend *Hannay*, for the Scandalous Preface and Queries, publiſhed under his Name, againſt the Yearly Meeting; therefore he hath not judged all Friends, in his Senſe.

He reſerves, he ſays, *to himſelf a Judgment of Diſcretion, as a private Perſon, the due Priviledge of every true Chriſtian.* It were well he would reſerve alſo to himſelf ſome *Diſcretion*, and exerciſe it *in Judging*, which is the *Duty* of every

true Christian; which had he done, he had not flung about his rash, indiscreet and *false Judgments* against some others, for holding gross and vile Errors, who are sounder in the true Faith than himself.

He asks, *Why is it thought such a Crime in me, to lay my Complaint before this Meeting, against some particular Persons, who have greatly injured and abused me.* Answer, He stood charged before in Print, with having *rejected the Advice and Judgment of the last Yearly Meeting*, and denied that Meeting also; and therefore it was unreasonable in him to offer, and expect this Meeting should receive his Accusations against the Members of this Meeting, till he had given this Meeting satisfaction for the Abuse and Contempt offered to the last Yearly Meeting. Besides, it is evident from the Paper he read in this Meeting, and which contained his Complaints and Accusations against several Members of it, that his design therein was first *to retard*, and finally to *disable* the Meeting from proceeding against him; for, besides that he excepts in that Paper, against many Members of the Meeting by Name, and others indefinitely, he therein excepts against the Meeting it self, as not having a true, free, and due Constitution. Now for him to complain to a Meeting, against some Members of it, and expect, and demand to have his Complaint heard and redressed by that Meeting, and yet at the same time deny that Meeting, to which he so complains, to be a duly or rightly Constituted Meeting, is one of the highest degrees of Extravagant,

travagant, Unreaſonableneſs, and I think, next to Madneſs: Yet thus did he.

Again he asks, p. 11. *Why ought not my Complaint to be heard againſt them, as theirs is heard againſt me?* I ask, whoſe Complaints were heard againſt him? The Meeting medled not with particular Complaints from, or againſt particular Perſons, nor do ſuch Complaints uſe to be laid before that Meeting. Therefore I, who perhaps had as much Cauſe of Complaint as any (having been charged by him, and that in Print, with Fifty Perverſions, Forgeries and falſe Accuſations) did not complain thereof to that Meeting; but, having my way open thro' the Preſs, have cleared my ſelf thereof in Print, to his ſhame.

He repeats here again the Advice, given by the Yearly Meeting before, that Friends ſhould be tender and kind to him; but *conceals the Conditions* annexed thereunto, *viz.* As he ſhould approve himſelf in Charity and Reconciliation with Friends, a Man of Peace; and ſhould anſwer the Chriſtian Advice of the Meeting then given him; on performance whereof that Advice to Friends, to be tender and kind to him, depended: All which Conditions he apparently and contemptuouſly broke ſoon after that Meeting was ended. And it is a known Rule, *Where the Condition is not obſerved, the Benefit depending thereupon cannot of right be claimed.* Very idle therefore it is in him to *mutter* againſt others, for interrupting him in his Teſtimony in Meetings, after that he, by *openly turning againſt Friends* as he had done, and *joining himſelf to a*

Separate Party and Meeting, (not owned by Friends, nor owning Friends) had deveſted himſelf of all Right, or reaſonable pretence of Right, to bear any Teſtimony, as a Friend, in any of Friends Meetings. And more idle yet it is (if more can well be) for him to quarrel with *W. Penn*, for calling him ſome Weeks ago in *Ratcliff* Meeting, Apoſtate, and Enemy to Truth and Friends; when he had many Months before that, as well as juſt then, publickly given undeniable proofs that he was ſo.

To ſave himſelf from a juſt Cenſure, for not anſwering the Contents of the Yearly Meetings Paper to him, he alledges that it is expreſt by the Word *Advice*, not *Command*; that *Advice is one thing, Command another*; that *he doth not find the Yearly Meeting Paper gave him any Command in this Caſe, and therefore no Tranſgreſſion*: The Anſwer which he ſays, p. 12. *G. W.* gave to this, is ſuch as he himſelf cannot anſwer, namely, That *the Word Advice hath a Twofold ſignification; one, when it related to an indifferent Matter* (for *G. K.* had urged what the Apoſtle *Paul* writ about ſingle Life and Marriage, 1 *Cor.* 7. 25, 40.) *Another, when it related to that which was a Command of God*, to wit, *to keep in Unity with Friends, and in Charity and Peace, and not to break the Peace of the Church by Contentions, and expoſing Friends to the World.* To this he could make no other Reply, than to confeſs (in his 12th page) *he ought to live in Unity, Charity and Peace with ſound and faithful Friends*; under which two *equivocal* Epithets he ſhelters himſelf, not reckoning any

to

to be ſound and faithful Friends, but ſuch as ſide and join with him againſt Friends.

As to the word *Advice*, under which he ſeeks ſhelter, I could ſhew him alſo (if it were worth the while) that though the Meeting in tenderneſs uſed thoſe words (*Advice* and *Senſe*) rather than ſome other words which might have been thought more ſevere and harſh; yet thoſe words, as uſed by the Meeting, carry in them *the force of a Command*: For in that part of the Paper, which mentions the *Separation* in *America*, (and which by Copulatives is connected with the former Sentence) the words are, *And how far ſoever* G. Keith *hath been concerned therein*, (which the general Senſe of Friends here is doth lye at his Door) *He* **ought** *now ſincerely to uſe his utmoſt Endeavours, and Intereſt with his Friends concerned, to remove it, and to help forward a reuniting*, &c. The words (**he ought**) there plainly ſhew, that the words (*Senſe* and *Advice*) as uſed by the Meeting, differed not ſo much from the word (*Command*) in nature and ſignification, as in ſoftneſs of Expreſſion. But to what purpoſe is it to obſerve this to him, by whom *Advice* and *Command* are alike diſregarded and rejected, if they anſwer not his Will, or End.

He carps alſo again at the word (*Body*) & ſays, p. 11. *I want to know what ye mean by The Body of the People called Quakers, and their Miniſters; If* (ſays he) *only the Faithful, I never charged them, and have again and again cleared them in Print.* Here again *he diſſembles moſt horribly*: For by the Faithful, he means *not the Body of*

Friends,

Friends, but such as, like himself, have *broken themselves off* from the Body of Friends. The Answer he reports *G. W.* to have made to his Question, what the Meeting meant by the Body of the People called Quakers, is this, p. 12. That *they meant all who walked in Unity with Friends, in the same Profession with them, and were Charitable and Peaceable.* This description of the Body of the People called Quakers, comprehends the Faithful, and them only: for the Unity of the People called Quakers, stands in that in which the Unfaithful cannot walk. And *G. K.* was fain to shift the Terms, before he could make a Reply to it. For, having first made an Excursion to set forth how long he hath been a Preacher, Writer, and Labourer among the Quakers, which he says is Thirty years, (though I believe he must discount some of those years for having been a Preacher, Writer, and Labourer against the Quakers) he says, *I never understood that all deserved to be called the Body, that did but outwardly profess Unity with Friends; and I am not such a Novice as not to know that it was the sense of many Friends, as well as my sense, that many professed Truth with us, and made a Profession of Unity, that were not in it*, &c. But can he think Others are such *Novices*, as not to know a difference between *Walking in* Unity with Friends, and but *Outwardly Professing* Unity with Friends? He himself hath *outwardly profest* Unity with Friends, since he *ceased to walk in* Unity with them. This shews he is but a *Shuffler*, not a fair Reasoner, and has not sincerity in his Undertaking. Now that it may farther appear

he

he uſes this Cavil about the Word (*Body*) but as a ſhifting Subterfuge, to ſave his Head, let it be obſerved, that in his other Pamphlet, called the *Nameleſs Bull*, p. 12. ſpeaking of thoſe of *Story*'s *Separation*, with whom he is now joyned, (though ſometime after his coming from *America*, being told by ſome (which did not prove a falſe Prediction) that he would fall in with the Separatiſts of *Harp-Lane*, he diſdainfully anſwered, No, *They might come to him, but he ſhould not go to them*) he makes no difficulty to call them *a Body*, and a conſiderable one too, and that from their ſuppoſed Number; ſaying, *There is a conſiderable Number and Body of them.* I am not out of hope, that his dropping in among them, may make their boaſted Number *leſs conſiderable*, by Awakening the more Simple among them, and Driving them back to the True Flock again. But ſince he *boggles* ſo at the word (*Body*) with reſpect to Friends, and yet can ſo readily uſe it with reſpect to thoſe Separatiſts; I would gladly know, whether he looks upon his *conſiderable Number and Body* of them he there mentions, to be *all* Faithful, *all* in the Poſſeſſion of the Life and Power of Truth, whereof they make an outward Profeſſion; if he does, that's more, I am perſwaded than they *all* do of him. But if he does not, does he not Egregiouſly *Play the Hypocrite*, in giving that Title to them by the Lamp, and yet pretend he dare not uſe it to Friends, becauſe he never underſtood, that *all* deſerved to be called the Body, that did but *Outwardly Profeſs* Unity with Friends, and that many Profeſſed Truth, that

that were not in the Life and Power of it.

In the Paper he Read, *p.* 11. and also in his Discourse, he calls it *a most unfair and unjust thing, that he was required* (so it seems, he understood the word *Advice*, for all his Cavilling about it) *to clear the Body of the People called Quakers from those Gross Errors charged on some few in* America; and he gives two Reasons for it; One, that *he knew not one of many hundreds of that People in divers places, nor their Faith, whether it be sound or unsound in these matters*; this Reason seems to me to have no Force in it: for surely, as he ought not to Charge any, but such as he certainly knew to be Un-sound; so he very well might, and ought to Clear, all whom he did not know to be Un-sound: His other Reason is, that *he certainly knew* W. P. G. W. and J. W. *were Guilty of some of those Gross Errors Charged on some in* America. This Pretended knowledge of his he must have had before he writ his Book, Called, *The Causeless Ground*, Printed soon after the Yearly Meeting in 1694. because he gives it as a Reason why he did not answer the Advice of that Meeting in that Race. Nay he must have had it before that Yearly Meeting, because he gives it as a Reason why he could not expect Justice at that Yearly Meeting, where these (he says) were Leading Men. These are his words (in his Narrat. p. 11.) *What Justice could I expect, that these being the Leading Men at the last Yearly Meeting, should fairly or sufficiently condemn these Mens gross Errors in Pensilvania*, &c. This I desire

ſire the Reader only to take notice of, and bear in Mind, till I ſhall come to ſpeak hereafter to his Liſt of groſs Errors, charged by him on thoſe Friends.

The reſt of his Narrative is moſtly ſpent in quarrelling with *W. Penn*, which he doth in ſuch a *rude* and *railing* manner, as manifeſts the heat and rage he was in, which was ſo apparent, that himſelf cannot but take notice of it, p. 14. confeſſing *he was much moved, and had ſcarce patience to hear*: yet in another place would excuſe that, which he ſays *ſome are pleaſed to call Paſſion and Railing*, with the *ſoft* Terms of *Free and Bold Speech*. But as Railing deſerves not to be regarded, ſo I ſhall take the leſs notice of the remaining part of his Narrative; only touching here and there a paſſage, and ſo leave it.

In his 13th page, he very malapertly tells *W. P. I am thy Elder Brother, and was a Preacher among the Quakers, before thou waſt a Quaker*: *W.* P. very gently replyed, *Thou boaſteſt of thy Antiquity, which I ſhould not do, were I in thy caſe.* This ſoft Anſwer a little check'd him, ſo that his Rejoynder was in ſomewhat a lower ſtain; *I anſwered*, ſays he, *I boaſt not of my Antiquity, but by thy own words, and the words of* G. W. *Ancient Brethren ſhould be regarded*, &c. That Ancient Brethren ſhould be regarded, is very true, and ſeaſonable; but that *Falſe Brethren*, or *Apoſtates*, becauſe they had antiently been Brethren, ſhould therefore be regarded as Antient Brethren, is a falſe Inference, and very unreaſonable: Antiquity in the Truth is honourable; *The hoary Head is a Crown of Glory*; but it is with

an

an *IF*, *if it be found in the way of Righteousness*, Prov. 16.31. But if it be found in the way of Unrighteousness, *as he is*, it is not a Glory, but a Shame; and he in glorying therein, doth but *glory in his shame*, as some of old did, *Phil.* 3. 19.

In the same 13th Page, he says, *If ye pass any Judgment against me, by your pretended inward sense, ye will be sufficiently discovered, what unjust Men ye are*: Yet in his 14th and 15th pages, when *W. P.* had declared, that at that Meeting at *Ratcliff*, wherein he gave Testimony against *G. K.* he was in no Passion, but transported by the glorious Power of God, *G. K.* calls that Transport, *a sinful Passion*, and passes sentence that *W. P.* had blasphemed, *in fathering his most sinful Passion upon the glorious Power and Spirit of God*; for which he censured others also, (and that indefinitely) saying, *It is a thing but too familiar with him, and many others of his Associates.* Now Reader, consider on what doth *G. K.* ground this Sentence of his, but his pretended *inward Sense?* Outward Evidence he brings none: And the outward Evidence that was given by others, was direct against him: For divers Friends who were present at that Meeting at *Ratcliff*, did in the Yearly Meeting, and in *G. K.*'s presence, declare that the Power of God was very eminently upon *W. P.* at that time when he denied *G. K.* (though this, and their Testimony also, that the Relation *W. P.* had then given of that matter, was true in Fact, *G. K.* leaves out of his Narrative; which shews his Narrative is not true, but partial.) Now-

seeing

seeing *G. K.* hath given his Judgment here against *W. P.* for Blaspheming, and that by or from his own pretended *inward Sense*, has he not thereby (to use his own words) sufficiently discovered what an unjust Man he is?

Now, although no Judgment was passed upon him by the Meeting, from inward Sense only, but upon outward Evidences, with respect to matters of Fact: Yet seeing he makes so light of inward sense, both in this and his other lately printed Pamphlets, I will remind him of something he formerly writ in behalf of inward Sense and Discerning, when his Sense (both inward and outward) was truer and clearer than it is now. In his Book called *Immediate Revelation not ceased*, p. 179. Answering an Objection, That a Man can be assured of his Estate before God, if he be justified by certain Signs, Characters and Marks, *&c.* He says, "But see-
"ing there are semblances of all these, a coun-
"terfeit Love both to God and Man, Meekness,
"Patience, *&c.* For the Hypocrite, who has no-
"thing of the true Love, Patience, Meekness,
"*&c.* yet he hath a likeness of them, and will
"proceed as far in the outward Actions of De-
"votion, Charity, Equity, *&c.* as the other that is
"the true Believer; yea, and even according
"to their own Confession, they may go beyond
"him. And so, whereas they say, The Tree is
"known by its Fruits, and so it is, but by what
"are the Fruits known? Two Men may be do-
"ing the same outward work, which has the
"same outward Appearance, and yet the one
"a meer Hypocrite, and the other a sincere
"Chri-

" Christian. Then by what can their Works
" or Fruits be judged? —— These Works,
" which carry in them an appearance to be
" good, and yet are not good, but dead works,
" empty, without Life; though they have a
" fair shew; yet they are rottenness within: ---
" How shall a Man judge of these? Now he
" who has Life in himself, the Birth begotten
" of God, he has a spiritual sence and discern-
" ing, whereby he can savour, smell and taste,
" of the Works, the Fruits of the good Tree;
" for they have a good savour, a living spiritu-
" al savour; they smell and taste of the Tree
" of Life on which they grow: Hence they are
" called Living Works; and these, in the Light
" which reveals them, and makes all manifest,
" are seen to be good. And the Works having
" but the Appearance, they also are seen and
" discerned to be such, and being evil, they
" cast an evil savour, by which in the Light,
" which begets the Discerning, they are felt,
" and he can have no Union with them, nor
" with the Tree on which they grow. And this
" Man discerneth, in the manifestation of the
" Light, both his Own, and his Neighbours
" Works, of what nature they are; by the ta-
" sting and smelling of the Fruit, the Tree is
" known, both in himself and his Neighbour.
" And this is a great Mystery, and hard to be re-
" ceived with such, who have not got that taste
" and discerning, begot in them of the Lord,
" which tasteth Words, as the Mouth tasteth
" Meat. But hereto I give my Testimony, that
" there is such a thing, and I do witness it in

" my

" my measure. This is it which enters into the " Kernel, and pierces through the outward ap- " pearance, and searches what is in the Center, " and brings to Light the hidden things of Dis- " honesty, and discovers the ravening Wolf in " the Sheep's Cloathing, whether in a Mans Self " or his Neighbour.

And in p. 188. speaking of the Children of God, he says, " If they did not know Infallibly one a- " nother, they could not have that Peace, and " Unity, and Concord one with another. How " could they discern the true Friend from the " Enemy, the secret Enemy, the Deceiver, " which is the most dangerous Enemy, and can " come into all Outwards, and Appearances " with Friends; can put on the Sheeps Cloath- " ing, and a Form of Godliness, but deny the " Power, and be an Enemy to it? A ravenous " Wolf can speak fair, yea, profess all the " Words and Principles of Truth, and come " the whole length of all Outwards, as is said, " and yet be a rotten Hypocrite, a Limb of " Satan a Brat of *Babylon*, void of all fear of " God: So, how shall he be discerned? See " *Mal.* 3. 18. Then shall ye return, and dis- " cern between the Righteous and the Wicked, " between him that serveth God, and him that " serveth him not.

Again, in p. 190. " Seeing *Babylon*'s Chil- " dren, the Whore's Brats, as is said, can " come into all outward Forms and Appear- " ances, either of Words or Practices, then " there is no way possible, how the Children of " the true Mother, can be known from the " Children of the Whore, or how the true Mo-

" ther her ſelf, can be known from the Whore,
" Myſtery *Babylon*, but by the Revelation of the
" Light and Life of Jeſus Chriſt. Again, p. 191.
" The falſe Prophet that comes in the Sheep's
" Cloathing, and is inwardly a ravening Wolf,
" that comes in the form of Words, the form
" of Godlineſs, he cannot deceive the Elect;
" they can beware of him, and fly from him,
" *Joh.* 10. 4, 5. *Mat.* 7. 15. And how could
" they beware of him, if they could not diſ-
" cern him to be ſuch? And theſe who ſay they
" are Miniſters, and are not, they can try their
" Spirits; it is more than their words, the A-
" nointing teacheth them, 1 *Joh.* 4. 1, 5, 6. and
" 1 *Joh.* 5. 27. And ſo can know, not the
" Speech of them that are puffed up, but the
" Power, wherein the Kingdom ſtandeth,
" 1 *Cor.* 4. 19, 20.

Now, not to Tranſcribe more, I deſire the Reader to obſerve from the foregoing, how exactly *G. K.* in deſcribing the Hypocrite, the Evil Tree, the Ravening Wolf, the falſe Prophet, *&c.* hath *deſcribed himſelf* in his preſent ſtate. And whether he has not ſaid enough, in the Quotations before given, to have juſtified the Meeting, had they given Judgment againſt him, only by that inward Spiritual Senſe, Savour and Diſcerning he ſpeaks of; which yet they did not, but with reſpect to Matters of Fact, proceeded upon outward Evidences, as I noted before.

I have now gone through his *partial Narrative*, and made ſome Obſervations on the moſt material parts of it. There follows in the ſame Pamphlet, A Liſt, he ſays, of Errors, which he pretends

pretends to have gathered out of ſome Books of Friends, on which it might be expected I ſhould now enter. But in as much as (for what *croſs* Reaſon I know not, unleſs it were to multiply Books; though in his Poſtſcript to that called, *A Loving Epiſtle*, he pretended to diſlike that way, alledging that the Scripture ſaith, *Of making many Books there is no end*) he hath Printed the Judgment of the laſt Yearly Meeting concerning him, with his Anſwer at length thereunto, in another *diſtinct* Pamphlet, dated but two days after the former, (which he needed not have done: For that Paper containing the Judgment of the Yearly Meeting was ſent him above a Week before the date of his firſt Pamphlet) I ſhall make bold (either with, or without his leave) to Connect his Anſwer to the Meeting's Judgment, with his foregoing Narrative, and thereby carry on the whole Matter in a continued Series, which he, for ſome odd or evil end or other, hath diſ-joined, and parted into two Pamphlets. Afterwards I intend to take notice of his Liſt of Errors.

He gives his latter Pamphlet this falſe and envious Title, *The pretended Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, their Nameleſs Bull of Excommunication given forth againſt* George Keith, *from a Party or Faction of Men, that call themſelves the Yearly Meeting, which they would have to be received, as the general Judgment and Sentence of the Quakers. With a brief Anſwer to the ſame, ſhewing, that for his Zealous and Conſcientious oppoſing their groſs Errors, and reproving the evil and wicked Practices of them in* Penſylvania, *whom they own to be their Brethren, particularly their Perſecution of*

G. K. *and some of his Friends, that Party has Excommunicated him.* This Title I call false and envious. *Envious,* in calling the Judgment of the Yearly Meeting, *A Bull*, which is a Term appropriated to the Pope's Mandates. *False*, in calling it *Nameless*, which hath to it the Name of the Clerk of that Meeting, who signed it by appointment of that Meeting, that gave it forth. *False* also, in saying it was given forth from the *pretended* Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, when as it was (and he knows it was) from the *real* Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, if ever the Quakers had a Yearly Meeting. *False* again, in saying it was given forth from a *Party* or Faction of Men, that call themselves the Yearly Meeting; whereas it was given forth by the *whole entire* Yearly Meeting, fully and unanimously concurring and agreeing, *not one dissenting*. *False* yet further, in saying, That Party has Excommunicated him for his Zealous and Conscientious opposing *their* gross Errors; whereas he had not charged the Yearly Meeting with any gross Errors, when the Judgment of that Meeting was given forth, nor yet hath: Though he hath since charged *Three* Friends that were Members of it. And lastly, both *false* and *envious*, in saying they have Excommunicated him, for reproving the Evil and Wicked Practices of them in *Pensylvania*, &c. Titles of Books usually bespeak the Contents thereof. If this doth so, the Reader may guess by this Title, made up of Falsehood and Envy, what he may expect in the Body of the Book, into which let us now look.

Having first printed the *Judgment* of the Year-

ly

ly Meeting, which in large Print takes up about a page and half; his *Answer* thereunto follows, which he calls *Brief*, though it fills between eight and nine pages. He begins it thus, *A Paper bearing this Title, At the Yearly Meeting in* London, *the 17th of the 3d Month, 1695. And having at the end of it these following words,* [*Signed by appointment of the Yearly Meeting, and in behalf thereof, as their Act, which is to my certain knowledge,* Benjamin Bealing] *came to my House, and was delivered to some in my Family the 17th of this instant* 1695. *the which Paper mentioneth no sort of People, nor what sort of Yearly Meeting it came from.* This he makes his first Cavil, and as idle as it is, he spends some time upon it. He had been in the Meeting but the day before, (and the day before that also) as the Narrative he has Printed of passages therein, sets forth. Now this Paper being sent to him, who knew beforehand the occasion of it, the Person that signed it, and brought it to him, and the Meeting from which it came, it was needless to give any descriptive Character of the Meeting for his Information; and so it appears: For after he hath wrangled a while about it, he says, *I do not in the least pretend Ignorance, so as not to know some particular Persons, who have had a main hand in it,* &c. He knew from what Meeting it came, and he knows that to be the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers; which is no other, as to its Constitution, or manner of Being, than it has been these many Years, or than it was when he seem'd well enough to like it, and as a Minister to be of it; which shews, his Exception now against the Constitution of it,

proceeds rather from Prejudice and Envy, than from ſound Reaſon or true Judgment. And if he will take the pains to read the Judgment that was given by the Church at *Jeruſalem* upon the Diſſention that aroſe about Circumciſion, *Acts* 15. he ſhall find the Direction or Inſcription of that to be *leſs particular*, than this which he excepts againſt. For this is directed from the Yearly Meeting, the place named, where it was held, *viz.* in *London*, and the Day of the Month and Year, whereon it was held, added; whereas that expreſſes neither Meeting, Place, nor Time; but only thus, *The Apoſtles, and Elders, and Brethren, ſend greeting unto the Brethren which are of the* Gentiles *in* Antioch, *&c.* yet we read not that that Judgment was excepted againſt for this. So that herein *G. K.* hath ſhewed himſelf a *more Impertinent Caviller* than thoſe Cavilling Jews.

Now the Exception which he makes both here in his Anſwer, and in the Paper he read in the Yearly Meeting, againſt the Conſtitution of that Meeting, is, its conſiſting of two Perſons ſent up from every County or Quarterly Meeting in *England* and *Wales*, together with them they call publick Friends, excluding generally others of the ſame Profeſſion, *&c.* *If this*, ſays he, *is meant by the Yearly Meeting, that hath ſent this* Paper *to me, I diſown all ſuch Conſtitution of a Yearly Meeting*, p. 4, and 5. And ſo I make no doubt, he would any Conſtitution of any Meeting, that ſhould have diſowned him. But for all his diſowning the Conſtitution of that Meeting, and diſowning it alſo to be the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers; yet that

Paper

Paper of his which he read in the Yearly Meeting, was directed, *To the* Yearly Meeting *of the People called Quakers, met at* London, such a day; and he hath so printed it since. And in the Title of that Book in which he hath printed it, he owns that Meeting which that Paper was given to, to be *the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers.* So that he can own the Meeting, and the Constitution of it, when he pleases, and so long as he thinks it may make for his advantage so to do, and disown it when he pleases again. How *sincere* he is in this, let the Reader judge.

But that he might seem to have the fairer pretence to except against the Meeting, and the Constitution thereof, he suggests divers things against them, which he cannot prove; As that they *assume a Power to make Laws, and give forth Edicts and Decrees to bind and oblige the Consciences of all these many Thousands in the Three Nations, and other Places of the World, that go under the outward Profession of Quakers,* &c. *Nameless Bull,* p. 4. This is Charging, by a *sly way* of suggestion, without Proof. What Proof can he bring, (for he doth bring none) that ever the Yearly Meeting did assume such a Power? What Instance can he give of any such Law, Edict or Decree made and given forth by that Meeting, to bind and oblige the Consciences of all those many Thousands in the Three Nations, and other parts of the World, *&c?* Let him produce those Laws, bring forth those Edicts, name those Decrees, if he can. So also speaking of *Chosen Members from the several Countries,* he says,

they are in great part Miniſters, and Penſioners paid by the reſpective Counties for that ſervice, and oft deſignedly choſen to bring to effect ſomething contrived beforehand by a particular Cabal, &c. Theſe are meer ſlanderous Reproaches, void of Truth, and deſigned for defamation only. Was he ever ſuch a Penſioner, or doth he know any that are? So again, *for excluding* (as he ſays) *generally others of the ſame Profeſſion*, &c. This is a known Falſhood, contradicted by conſtant Practice. When did he ever know a Yearly Meeting ſo held, that only two from a County, and Miniſters, were admitted, and others of the ſame Profeſſion, whom they own'd to be in Unity with them, were *generally excluded*? It is well known to be otherwiſe; and that Sober, Grave and Weighty Friends, who are known to be in Unity with the Meeting, are not excluded from the Meeting, nor from giving their Judgments in the Meeting, in Matters relating to the Meeting, though not publick Miniſters, nor choſen by the Quarterly Meetings they belong unto. What therefore *G. K.* quotes out of *R. Barclay*'s Book, called, *The Anarchy*, &c. and applies againſt the Yearly Meeting, is not againſt it, but agrees well with the Practice of that Meeting, and that Meeting with it, *viz.* That the People called Quakers exclude no Member of the Church to give his Judgment. And it is alſo to be obſerved, That the Yearly Meeting now is the ſame in its Conſtitution and Practice, as it was when *R. B.* writ that Book, and before; therefore *R. B.* who lived and died in Unity with the Yearly

Meeting,

Meeting, and who writ that Book chiefly in defence of that Meeting, and of the Order of Truth eſtabliſhed amongſt, and practiſed by Friends, againſt the Cavilling Exceptions of other Apoſtates, was not likely to write any thing therein againſt the Conſtitution of the Yearly Meeting, nor did. And though *G. K.* often Cites *R. B*'s words out of that Book, called, *The Anarchy*; yet it is ſeldom that he can draw any thing from thence to anſwer his purpoſe, without *miſciting* the words, or *perverting* and wreſting them from their true ſenſe and meaning: Of his doing which, I have formerly given ſome Inſtances in Print, which he neither hath cleared, nor ever can clear himſelf from. And whereas he now ſays, in his *Nameleſs Bull*, p. 5. *For any Number of Men to aſſume a Power, in an Aſſembly, to extend to all others, as ſuppoſe many Thouſands, that what Judgment, or Sentence they ſhall paſs, relating either to things of Religion, or Perſons, ſhall oblige the Conſciences of all theſe Thouſands under the ſame Profeſſion, is directly contrary to that Chriſtian Liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made every true Chriſtian free, and is a Popiſh and Tyrannical Inveſion, and Uſurpation over Mens Conſciences*, &c. If by this he means the Yearly Meeting at *London*, he had no ground thus to ſpeak: For that Meeting hath never aſſumed ſuch a Power, that I know of. That Meeting, being gathered in the Name of Chriſt, and endued with his Power, is thereby guided and enabled to perform thoſe Services, to his Honour, and his Churches good, for which it is gathered. And they that are preſerved by the

ſame

ſame Power in Unity with it, and with the Meeting in it, need no other Obligation upon their Conſciences, than what that Divine Power in themſelves lays, to engage them to conſent to, and join with, what in the movings of the ſame Power, is concluded on and agreed to. But if *G. K.* means, That the Church of Chriſt hath not Power to give forth a Judgment or Sentence, relating either to things of Religion or Perſons, that may oblige the Conſciences of thoſe under the ſame Profeſſion; he therein flatly contradicts contradicts both the Scriptures and *R. B.* in that Book which he ſo often applauds, and hath them both directly againſt him. The Scriptures in that great Inſtance of the Judgment given by the Church at *Jeruſalem*, in the Caſe of Circumciſion, *Acts* 15. and *R. B.* in that Book, called, *The Anarchy*, p. 48. where, having put the Queſtion, *Whether the Church of Chriſt have Power in any Caſes that are Matters of Conſcience, to give a poſitive Sentence and Deciſion, which may be Obligatory upon Believers?* He ſays, *I anſwer Affirmatively, ſhe hath, and ſhall prove it from divers Inſtances, both from Scripture and Reaſon*; which he hath done. And in p. 53. he again ſays, *I affirm, and that according to Truth, that a the Church and Aſſembly of God's People, may, and hath Power to decide by the Spirit of God in Matters Fundamental and Weighty (without which no Deciſion, nor Decree in whatever Matters is available) ſo the ſame Church and Aſſembly alſo in other Matters of leſs moment, as to themſelves, yet being needful and expedient with a reſpect to the Circumſtance of Time, Place,*

Place, and other Things that may fall in, may, and hath Power, by the same Spirit, and no other ways, being acted, moved and assisted, and led by it thereto, to pronounce a positive Judgment, which no doubt will be found Obligatory upon all such as have a sense and feeling of the mind of the Spirit, though rejected by such as are not watchful, and so are out of the feeling and unity of the Life. And in p. 68. he says, *That their* de Facto, *or effectually meeting together, and giving a positive Judgment in such Cases, will* not import *Tyranny and Usurpation, or any inconsistency with the Universal Priviledge that all Christians have, to be led by the Spirit.* &c. Nothing can be more opposite to G. *K*'s last recited Sentence, if he thereby mean the Church of Christ; and if he doth not so mean, he says nothing to the purpose.

His Exceptions in p. 5. against the Meeting, because *the Door was shut*, and some Friends stood at it, to put by such from going in as had no business there, is not less Idle than his former. Would he have Meetings of that kind, in such a *Populous* City, and in such a *publick* Place, stand open to all Comers, or Passers-by, as the Meetings for Worship only, do? This shews his great want of discrection, to distinguish the different Natures, End and Services of Meetings. But whereas he says, They *refused to let in some that desired to come in, and yet were opened by them*; There is not much heed to be taken to what he says in any case; none at all in that case: For he is not a proper Judge who are owned, and who not. If he might judge in that case, there is not perhaps any so open an Enemy as he would not bring in. For it is ob-

servable

ſervable in the entrance of his Narrative, that when he himſelf offering to enter, was ſtopt, and told he was not in Unity with Friends; he replied, I know no Meeting as yet in *England* that hath diſowned me. Now if he could have the confidence to have *thruſt* in, who himſelf had *denyed that Meeting* the Year before, *trampled* with contempt upon the Judgment of it, and behaved himſelf as an *open* and common *Enemy*; whom may we ſuppoſe he would have judged unfit to have been let in? Not any of that *Separate Company* to be ſure, amongſt whom he is of late fallen, divers of whom have not been particularly, and by name diſowned by any Meeting. For what neceſſity is there, that a Meeting ſhould formally diſown thoſe to be of us, who by turning againſt us, and ſeparating themſelves from us, have openly diſowned us, and declared themſelves not to be of us? But it is evident from the Methods he propoſes, his deſign is to render ſuch Meetings either *impracticable* to be held, or *unprofitable* and uſeleſs, if they could be held For firſt, the Door muſt ſtand open to all Comers, (whatever, either Curioſity, of captious Humour, draws them;) and all that are in the Profeſſion of Truth, how little ſoever of it they poſſeſs; nay, all that have profeſſed to be of us, though they are departed from us, if they have not been formerly diſowned, muſt (according to his method) of right be admitted (if they deſire it) to be preſent, to *hear*, *ſee*, and *give Judgment*; and if a Judgment be given, *all theſe* muſt ſeverally ſet their names to that Judgment, or elſe it is

with

with him, but a *Nameless Ball*. Now it is worthy of a considerate and attentive Man's thoughts, how such a Meeting as he proposes could be obtained; or of what *good use* it could be, if it were obtained? He mentions himself, the *Many Thousands*, that go under the outward Profession and Denomination of Quakers. And what if I should multiply by Ten, and call it the *Many Ten Thousands*? Now suppose all these (without distinction of Age or Sex, which he provides not against) should have *equal desire*, as apprehending themselves to have *equal right*, by vertue of Profession, to be present in such a Meeting, to hear, see, and every one give Judgment; what place could be capable of receiving such Multitudes? To come nearer to the matter, I doubt not but there are, under the Profession of Truth, within the Cities and Suburbs of *London* and *Westminster*, more Persons than the largest Meeting-House we have is capable to contain. Add to them but half so many out of the adjacent Counties; and where should they be disposed? But overlooking all this, and supposing such Number assembled somewhere; how is it conceivable that all those could so hear and see, as thereby to receive such satisfactory Information as therefrom to give Judgment in a case Propounded? And next, how that Judgment should be given? He excepts against taking *silence for consent*; saying in his Narrative, True Copy, p. 15. *It is not always true.* If every Individual must express his Judgment, in what time can that be done? Or how shall it be known whether all do express

preſs their Judgment, unleſs the whole Multitude be *called over* by Name? And how ſhould that be done without a Liſt or Roll of names; both which he ſeems to be offended at. But this is not all. If the Sun would ſtand ſtill, to lengthen a Day long enough for ſuch a Multitude, ſeverally and diſtinctly to pronounce their Sentence, yet would not this ſerve his turn: *they muſt all ſet their hands to it too*; and in what time could that be done, or in what Paper could the Names be contained? He is expreſs in this, in that Paper which he read in the laſt Yearly Meeting, wherein he took upon him thus to direct the Meeting; *What Paper ye give out concerning me, let it be Signed with all your hands that give Judgment in the Caſe, and not laid on the Clark, that it may appear all preſent are unanimous in the ſaid Judgment*, True Copy, &c. p. 5. And becauſe the Meeting did not obſerve *his Order* therein, but ordered their Clark to Sign it on behalf of the Meeting, he is impatiently angry, and calls it, *The Nameleſs Bull; a work of Darkneſs, acted and brought forth in the dark; a Birth without a legitimate Father; a nameleſs Child*, &c. which ſhews his Wrath and Envy, not Reaſon, much leſs Chriſtianity. In this alſo he has out-done thoſe troubleſome *Jews* of old, that raiſed the Controverſy about Circumciſion; for we read not that they excepted againſt the Churches Judgment in that caſe, though it doth not appear from the Text, that the Apoſtles, &c. did ſign it themſelves, or appoint any other to ſign it in their name. The reaſon he gives, why he would have ſuch Judgment Signed by

every

every individual, shews his design in proposing it. It is, *That it may appear all present are unanimous in the Judgment.* This is his *Master-Peice*: A sure way (if allowed) by which any, to whom such Judgment is due, may prevent it's ever being given. For first the Door must be open for all Comers. Next, All that make any profession of Truth (or that have done, and have not been formally disowned by a Meeting) must have liberty to be present, to hear, see, and give Judgment, though never so many Thousands such should come; (else, with him, the Constitution is nought.) And lastly, All that are present (be they never so many) must to a Man be unanimous in the Judgment (else, with him, the Judgment is void.) And truly, as the Proverb says of an ill Singer, He that is in the Fire, and would not come out, to hear such an one Sing, would deserve to be burnt: So one might say of *G. K.* were he in danger to be condemned by such a Meeting, and would not provide to have some one, at least, there, to dissent from the rest, and thereby keep the Meeting from being (in his Sense) unanimous, he would deserve, (by that Proverb) to be condemned; which, I dare pass my Word, he will never be, in a Meeting of his Constitution. How easie had it been, upon the Term he proposes, for him to have brought one or two from *Harp-Lane*, to have fetcht him off at the Yearly Meeting, by their dissenting from the concurrent Sense of that Meeting? I have taken this small pains, partly, to Answer *G. K's Cavils*; partly, to lay open his

Design,

Design, and the *Folly* of it; and partly, by this brief Description, to set forth the *deformity* of *Disorder* and *Confusion*. Of which, and the inconveniences and dangers that attend it, Wise Men in all Ages, have been so apprehensive, that in all Civilized Nations (at least) and where freedom is retained, when any thing, whether Civil or Religious, relating to a multitude, has been to be treated of, considered, debated and concluded, it has been referr'd to a competent number of the same Society, Body, or People, chosen by free and joint Consent of the rest.

He suggests also, *Nameless Bull*, p. 5, and 6. that the Meeting takes ways, *either by Persuasions, or Terrifications, to gain the Universal and Unanimous Consent of them, called the Commissioners, or Chosen Members from every County.* Of this he pretends to give an Instance, going on thus—— *As doth plainly appear by the late most absurd and insolent Method, more like the* Spanish *Inquisition, than a free Assembly of sincere Christians, they did take with a Preacher, one of their Commissioners, or Chosen Members; who having said in private, out of the* Meeting, *he could sooner Die, or lose his Right Hand, than sign to a Paper disowning* G. Keith, *which coming to their Intelligence, that there was such a Person, but not knowing who he was, they were so earnest to find him out, that they caused call over the Roll, a List of the Names of the Persons sent from the respective Counties, to find out this Person, asking them one by one, to find him out; and the poor Man, not daring to Lie, owned he was the Person; and being terrified, lest he should*

be

be severely proceeded against by them, he came (with some others to be Witnesses to his Recantation) and disowned to me what he had formerly said, though a few Hours before, he professed so great a Concern and Tenderness of Conscience towards me. That this Story is partly true in Fact, I grant. But *G. K*'s suggestion, which he brings this to prove, *viz.* That Endeavours were used by the Meeting, either by Perswasion or Terrification, to gain the unanimous Consent of the Members, I utterly deny, as *altogether false.* 'Tis true, that the Person mentioned by him, did, during the Meeting, speak some such words as *G. K.* here reports him to have said, and this I suppose was *privately* said, for it was at *G. K*'s own House: And though he designedly conceals how, and by whom this private Communication came to be divulged, saying only, (*which coming to their intelligence*) yet he himself is (*Lupus in Fabula*) the Person that brought it to their Intelligence. For he coming into the Meeting the same Day, did in a *braving* manner tell the Meeting, *he did not believe they would be unanimous enough to give forth a Testimony against him, for that one who was a Member of that Meeting,* (and whom he called a *Commissioner*, a term not used by us) *had told him within six Hours before, that he would rather Die, or have his Right Hand cut off, than sign a Paper to disown him.* Hereupon the Meeting desired *G. K.* to Name that Person, that if he were then present, he might be heard, *if he had any thing to say in his behalf.* But *G. K.* refused to name, and said he did not know whether he was present,

ſent, or no. This gave occaſion for that Propoſal, which, in the cloſe of his Narrative, *G. K.* ſays *Fra. Campfeild* made, *That ſilence ſhould be made, and if any were diſſatisfied with the Laſt Years Judgment, let ſuch declare their diſſatisfaction; and if they did not, they were not honeſt Men.* Which *G. K.* oppoſed, and in an uneaſie Heat ſtarting up, ſaid he would be gone, and went. After he was gone, a Concern came upon many Members of the Meeting, as did of old, in another Caſe, upon the Diſciples of Chriſt, who, when he had ſaid, *One of you ſhall betray me*, began every one to ask, *Is it I?* Mat. 26. 21, 22. Friends, who knew themſelves to be clear, were willing their clearneſs might appear. And becauſe none knew, but the Perſon concerned, whether the Story was true or falſe, it was propoſed by ſome, and followed by others, that in as much as it was charged on one, who was ſaid to come up from a County, the Names of all that came up from the ſeveral Counties ſhould be called over, that each might have opportunity to clear himſelf. Which Method being taken, the Party concerned, before it came directly to himſelf, acknowledged himſelf to be the Perſon that had ſpoken thoſe words, or words to that effect, to *G. K.* and withal, did then declare in the open Meeting to this effect, That he did not ſpeak thoſe words from an Approbation he had of *G. K.* but becauſe, not having been at the Yearly Meeting the Year before, when *G. K*'s Buſineſs was examined and opened, and by that means not having had a full Knowledge of the former Proceedings,

ceedings, he thought it not fit for him to set his Hand to a Paper against him. But that now having, since he spake so to him, seen him in the Meeting there, and observed his Behaviour, Speech, and Spirit, he was satisfied that *G. K.* was out of the way. Upon this account it was, that he readily and willingly went to clear his Intention to *G. K.* and let him know the sense he had now of him. That some went with him is true, and was both reasonable in it self, and desired by him: For otherwise, had he gone alone, *G. K.* might have wrested his words, or charged him with words he had not spoken. But that he was terrified lest he should be severely proceeded against by the Meeting, and therefore came to him, (as he suggests) is a *malicious slander* upon the Meeting, which I do not believe the Person himself will own. Now Reader, having heard the whole Matter, as it was, (according to the best of my remembrance) judge whether what the Meeting did in this Case, was any way like the *Spanish Inquisition*, (to which *G. K.* maliciously compares it) or whether the Method they used, deserved to be called, as it is by him, *most absurd and insolent*; or was any other than might very well become a free Assembly of sincere Christians. Yet such is the *rancour* of this Man's Spirit against us, that to draw the Hatred of the People, if not the Displeasure of the Civil Magistrate upon us, he again, in the close of that Story says, *This Passage is so considerable an advance towards the erecting the* Spanish *Inquisition among the Quakers, that I hope some will be awakened to take notice of it,*

and withſtand it. But the beſt on't is, his *Folly*, as well as *Envy*, is ſo conſpicuous in the Compariſon, that I doubt not but every Conſiderate Reader will *ridicule* him for the one, as well as *Condemn* him for the other.

He makes yet, in this 6th page of his *Nameleſs Bull*, ſome *feeble* Attempts to invalidate, or weaken, the Judgment of the Meeting againſt him; but through his *haſte*, or *heat*, he (here, as in divers places of his other Pamphlet, called *The true Copy*, which is a ſign his Head is more than uſually diſcompoſed) has left his Sentence *imperfect*, and thereby the ſence ſo broken, that it is not very eaſie to underſtand his meaning: yet, ſo far as I can gueſs at it, it is, That he is willing to perſwade himſelf, that among ſo many as were preſent in that Meeting, it may not be impoſſible that ſome might be there that did not own that Sentence, ſince every individual there was not asked; this is indeed playing at ſmall-Game; and re-minds me of the Anſwer he gave at the Yearly Meeting before, to ſome that took notice what *trifling* things he inſiſted on, which was, *That his caſe was like that of a drowning or ſinking Man, who will naturally catch hold of any thing, though but a Twig, or Ruſh, to hang by.*

In the ſame page he complains, That the Paper againſt him *is to go over all places of the World, where the People called Quakers have their Meetings*, &c. How knows he that? The Meeting did not Print it; and without Printing, it would be difficult to ſend it to all places of the World where we have Meetings. But he

he by Printing it, has facilitated that work; ſo that now 'tis probable it may go further than otherwiſe it would have done. But what if it ſhould go into all places where we have Meetings? What inconvenience is there in that? Why, *it declares the ſenſe of the Meeting to be, That he ought not to Preach or Pray in any of Friends Meetings, nor be Owned or Received as one of them.* Well, What then? That's ſtill with a Limitation and Condition, viz. *Whileſt he* (who is gone from the Bleſſed Unity of the Peaceable Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and hath thereby Separated himſelf from the Holy Fellowſhip of the Church of Chriſt) *ſhall continue in an Unreconciled and Uncharitable State; and until by a Publick and Hearty Acknowledgment of the great Offence he hath given, and Hurt he hath done, and Condemnation of himſelf therefore, he give Proof of his Unfeigned Repentance, and do his endeavour to Remove and Take off the Reproach he hath brought upon Truth and Friends.* Doth he Reſolve never to do this? he is then *ſo much the worſe:* And indeed hitherto he has given no ground to hope or expect it: but ſure I am, till he doth this, he is not fit to Preach or Pray in any of our Meetings, nor to be Owned or Received as one of us. And therefore I am Satisfied, how far ſoever this Senſe of the Meeting be Spread, it doth *no Wrong to him:* yet fain would he bring ſome *Odium* upon the Meeting; and therefore he ſuggeſts that there is ſome Deſign in Sending this Paper out ſo generally, and Nameleſs as he falſly ſays it is (who, in contradiction to himſelf, has acknowledged;

that *Benjamin Bealing*'s name was to it, by the Appointment and on the behalf of the Yearly Meeting) *Ye see*, says he, *it is of an Universal Extent, without all Limitation of Places, which is to make their Yearly Meeting at* London, *consisting of a few Particulars, as Universal as the Church of* Rome *maketh her Self to be*; I say, *it is worthy of Enquiry what the Design is*, says he, *that such an Edict or Sentence should go forth against me*, &c. Here his *Envy* has made him again bewray his *Folly*, in the comparing Yearly Meetings to the Church of *Rome*, and calling the Paper sent to him by that Meeting, an *Edict*; which word in its proper signification, and common acceptation, imports a *Command*, *Ordinance*, *Injunction*, and is so used by the Church of *Rome*; whereas that Paper, sent him by the Meeting, doth not Command, Ordain, Injoyn, any thing: but only declares the Sence and Judgment of the Meeting: doth the Church of *Rome* do so, and only so? If She did, Christendom would have less cause to Complain of her. I think no Person, of common Sence, will blame the Meeting for declaring their Sence, how far soever that Declaration of it should go. The Meeting did not take upon it to Command, or Enjoyn all others under the same Profession, to Receive and Acknowledge their Sence; but being well Satisfied they had Received from God the Sence and Judgment they gave, they were Content to leave it to the witness of God in the Conscience of every one, to whom it should come; not doubting but such as have a

True

True Savour of the Things of God, will Savour it to be of God.

In Pag. 7. He ſays, *As for the Contents of the ſaid Bull, as it is nameleſs, ſo it may be ſaid to have neither Horns nor Teeth.* There's the leſs hurt in it then. But why doth he mention *Horns* and *Teeth* with relation to a *Paper?* Doth he do this to make *Sport* for himſelf, or for his Reader? And why doth he call that *Paper*, which the Meeting ſent him a *Bull?* (which he repeats *ad Nauſeam uſque*) Is it to ſhew his *Wit*, or vent *his Anger?* Since he delights ſo much in *Bulliſh Metaphors*, were it fit for me to *imitate his folly*, I could ſhew him a *Bull* of his own making, when in his Narrative, he called the Table a *ſtately Fabrick*, **Erected Low** *upon the Floor:* This is ſuch a *Solœciſm* in Speech, as we in the Country call *a Bull*; and may paſs for a ſtranger ſort of *Bull* too, than that he calls *Nameleſs*; for if that (as he ſays) may be ſaid to have neither *Horns* nor *Teeth*; this, of his own making, may as well be ſaid to have neither *Head* nor *Tayl.* If he, or others, ſhall think this Paſſage too *jocoſe*, or pleaſant, let him learn henceforth to *handle ſerious thing ſeriouſly*, and avoid *invidious* Reflections and Compariſons: And let others conſider, that a *Fool* (which great Schollars often times prove, when they turn againſt the Truth of God, the Spring of true Wiſdom) may, in the Judgment of a wiſe Man, be *anſwered according to his Folly*, Prov. 26. 5. But if that which he calls a *Nameleſs Bull*, hath neither *Hornes* nor *Teeth*, what need he be ſo afraid of it? Why make ſuch an Out-cry? Why fence ſo

much againſt it? So *harmleſs* a Thing, as had neither *Horns* nor *Teeth*, (could neither *bite* nor *gore*) he might, one would think, have let paſs, without ſo much ado, ſo great a clamour. Nor doth it beſpeak Manhood in him, to let looſe ſo many *Dogs* (if according to his own Metaphor, I may ſo call his *ſnarling* Reflections) as he has done, againſt ſuch an Innocent Bull, as he repreſents this to be, which (if he ſees aright) hath neither *Horns* nor *Teeth* to *offend* him, or *defend* it ſelf. But, to draw off from this ſtrain, (into which I did not ſtep, either to pleaſe my ſelf, or raiſe any lightneſs in my Reader; but to give *G. K.* a ſtroke of *due Correction for his abuſive Folly*) ſince he allows that *Paper*, which he calls a *Bull*, to have neither *Horns* nor *Teeth*, I hope he will not complain of *Perſecution*, or *Severity*, from it, nor liken it any more to the Bulls of the Romiſh Church.

In the ſame Page, having cited ſome words out of the Meeting's Paper, ſignifying *they were ſatisfied both by his Printed Books, and other outward Evidences, with reſpect to matters of Fact, and by that Divine Senſe*, &c. *That the ſaid G. Keith hath been of late, and yet is acted by an Unchriſtian Spirit*, he objects, *This is only ſaid, but no paſſages in any of his Books brought againſt him, to ſatisfie any moderate Enquirer, nor any outward Evidence, with reſpect to matter of Fact, ſo much as alledged, to prove their general Charge.* I anſwer, Such *Particularities* were proper to the *Examination* of the Cauſe, not to the *Judgment* or Sentence given thereupon. When or where did he ever ſee the particular matters of Evidence expreſſed

in

in a Sentence or Judgment? Evident it is, that as to matter of Fact, the Meeting had recourſe both to his Books, (ſome of which were Publickly read in the Meeting) and to other outward Evidences, (who in his preſence gave their Evidence) and from both were fully ſatisfied to give forth that Judgment they did. And therefore he doth not ſay true, in ſaying, No Paſſages in any of his Books, were brought againſt him, nor any outward Evidence, with reſpect to matter of Fact, ſo much as alledged to prove the Charge: For it was upon outward Evidence (both of his Books, and Eye and Ear-witneſſes) with reſpect to matter of Fact, that the Meeting proceeded, as is expreſly alledged and and ſet forth in that Paper, which declares the Meeting's Senſe concerning him. He is greatly to be blamed therefore for ſaying, (as a Reflection on the Meeting) *As for the pretence to a Divine Senſe, it is but vain and preſumptuous, ſo to judge a Man to be of an Unchriſtian Spirit, without External Evidence in matter of Doctrine and Fact brought againſt me, none of which they have brought:* For External Evidence was brought againſt him, and is ſo expreſt in the Meeting's Paper ſent to him. And whereas he ſays, *Seeing by that which they call a Divine Senſe, they have falſly and unjuſtly judged me, without giving any proof of their Charge, I am bold and free in my Spirit to ſay their Senſe is not Divine, but Carnal, and Senſual, for no Divine Senſe will lead any Man, or Men, to be falſe Accuſers.* I tell him, and all others, that in ſuggeſting he was falſly accuſed, or judged by the Yearly Meeting, with

reſpect

reſpect to Matter of Fact, without outward Evidence, he himſelf is a *falſe Accuſer*. And he is too bold and preſumptuous in denying that Senſe that opened in the Heavenly Life in the Meeting, to be Divine, and in calling it Carnal and Senſual. And in calling the Judgment of the Meeting *unrighteous*, and ſaying, *It hath neither the Divine Life nor Senſe to Seal it, but that it's probable a Power of Darkneſs might run through the Meeting, and deceive many by its falſe appearance of Life*, he hath *impiouſly Blaſphemed* that Divine Life and Power, which was eminently ſeen and felt in the Meeting, and which he is departed from, and turned againſt; and for which the Diſpleaſure of the Lord is gone forth in Judgment againſt him; which he will one Day feel, though now he hardens himſelf.

His taxing the Meeting with writing *Nonſenſically*, in ſaying, *The Divine Senſe, in the Openings of the Heavenly Life, ran, as a mighty Stream, through the Meeting*, is a *Nonſenſical Cavil* of his own. It doth not confound the Life with the Senſe that the Life gives, as he (*without*, and againſt *Senſe*) alledges; for ſince he grants the Life, which gives the Senſe, may be properly ſaid to run as a Stream, in the Aſſembly of the Faithful; the Senſe which the Life ſo gives, may as properly be ſaid to run with the Life, in the Openings thereof, and in the ſame Stream or Current, through the Meeting. And though to countenance his Cavil, he *changes the Term* from a *Divine* Senſe, to *Men's* Senſe, (which ſhews him to be a *Sophiſter*) ſaying, *It is moſt improper*

proper to ſay, That Mens Senſe runs through a Meeting; yet even in that he errs: For if Men's Senſe could not run through an Aſſembly, an Aſſembly of Men could not have a concurrent Senſe upon any Matter; for to Concur, ſignifies to run together.

He ſays, p. 7. *In my Paper I delivered to them at their Meeting, I demanded them to let me know what they had againſt me, either in Doctrine or manner of Life and Converſation, and was moſt willing to have been brought to a Tryal before them.* What the Meeting had againſt him, was declared to him in the Meeting, and he hath given ſome Touches of it, in his brief and partial Narrative. But can any one believe he ſpeaks ſincerely, when he ſays, He was moſt willing to have been brought to a Tryal before them, whom he denied to be a duly Conſtituted Meeting, and calls a Party or Faction? Was he moſt willing to be brought to a Tryal before a Party or Faction? How ill doth this Matter hang together!

Upon pretence that the Meeting's Judgment is general, and that therefore it were *but waſte of Time and Paper, to give any other but a general Anſwer*, he ſlides off from the buſineſs, and ſpends moſt part of the reſt of his Pamphlet, in *railing* againſt ſome particular Friends, whom he groſly charges with holding and preaching groſs Errors. But this being only what he delivers upon his own Credit, I ſhall not take notice of, farther than to obſerve, that what he ſays on that Subject, in this Pamphlet, is without all proof, or ſhew of proof. Some few things

things remain to be touched on in his Pamphlet, relating to the Paper ſent him by the Yearly Meeting, and then to his Liſt.

In p. 9. he ſays, *Whatever Humane Authority they uſurp, to cut me off from ſome particular viſible Meetings, or Perſons, they have no Divine Authority or Power to cut me off either from Chriſt, or his faithful Followers.* To this I anſwer, The Yearly Meeting did neither uſurp, nor pretend to exerciſe, or have any *Humane* Authority to cut him off; nor did they exerciſe the Divine Authority and Power they have, *to cut him off.* Their Judgment is rather *declarative*, That he hath *cut himſelf off* from Chriſt, and his faithful Followers; for they therein ſay, *It is the Senſe and Judgment of this Meeting, That the ſaid* George Keith *is gone from the bleſſed Unity of the Peaceable Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and hath thereby ſeparated himſelf from the holy Fellowſhip of the Church of Chriſt.*

Again he ſays, *Their Bull is but an empty blaſt of Air, that hath not killed, nor I hope, ever ſhall kill the Life of my Soul, or that holy Fellonſhip I have had, and ſtill have with a faithful and ſincere Remnant among that People.* His *Scornful Scoff*, uttered in an *airy vaunt*, I paſs by, and to the reſt reply; The Judgment given by that Meeting was not intended to *kill* the Life of his Soul, (underſtanding thereby that which is the true Life of a Soul) but to bring him back (if poſſible) to that, which could recover his Soul to Life, out of that Death and Darkneſs, which, by joining with the Spirit of the Wicked One in himſelf, and running out, through the Inſtiga-

tion

tion thereof, into Prejudice, Bitterneſs, Enmity and Oppoſition to God's People, he hath brought upon his Soul. And as for the faithful and ſincere Remnant he pretends to have Fellowſhip with, it may eaſily be underſtood what they are, both by his actual falling in with the old Separatiſts (though heretofore diſowned by him) and by what he ſays, p. 11, 12. concerning them. Where ſpeaking againſt the Judgment of the Yearly Meeting, and that it ought not to be called the Act or Judgment of the Body of that People; He ſays, *Had all there preſent at the Yearly Meeting (ſo called) been unanimous in their unjuſt Sentence againſt me, and ten times more a greater number with them; yea, ſuppoſe they can get this their unjuſt Sentence againſt me, confirmed by all their Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in* England (*which yet I think it will be a very hard, if not impoſſible thing for them to obtain*) *yet this doth not prove that they are not a Faction or Party, ſeeing it is ſufficiently known, that for many Years paſt, there hath been a Breach among the People called Quakers, in relation to the Church Government of Women, and other circumſtantial Things, impoſed by a Party among them. None of them of the other ſide,* ſays he, *that oppoſe ſome Humane Impoſitions*, &c. *as many do well own me*, &c. *ſo I know not any that diſown me, or that approve of this Sentence*, &c. *and yet there is a conſiderable Number and Body of them.* See now the ground of his calling the Yearly Meeting a Faction or Party all along. He had in his Eye another Party, who had ſeparated themſelves from the Body of Friends before, and,

by

by a *Scotch Figure*, he would make them to be the Body, who had *rent themſelves off* from the Body; and the Body of Friends, from whom that Party is gone off, to be but a Party or Faction; whereas in *Common Uſe*, as well as *Propriety of Speech*, that's a *Party*, which *parts it ſelf* from the Body, not the Body which it is parted from. But how faithful or ſincere however he may account that *Remnant* he ſpeaks of, and is gone to, he cannot rightly call them a *Remnant among the People called Quakers*, becauſe they do not *remain with* or among that People, but have *diſ-joined* and ſeparated themſelves from them. Neither do I think it any Credit to that Remnant (as he calls them) to be called faithful and ſincere by him, who is ſo far from being faithful or ſincere himſelf. But it is obſervable how he *accommodates* his Speech to *Humour* that Party, alledging the Breach on their Parts to have been in relation to the *Church-Government of Women*, calling the things oppoſed by them *Humane* Impoſitions, impoſed by a Party. Thus, that he may make himſelf *Head* of a Party, he can forget his former Sentiments, join with what he has oppoſed, and to *ingratiate* himſelf with them, learn to ſpeak their Dialect and Style. But ſince he frequently mentions *R. Barclay*'s Book, called, *The Anarchy*, and that ſeemingly with great regard (though written chiefly as a *Check* to that *Libertine* Spirit, which then began to work and appear in that *Party* he is now fallen in amongſt) I will here Tranſcribe a Paſſage out of it, by which he may ſee the ground of his own running

ning out. It begins in the 11th Page, and is thus.

'Now the Ground of all Schiſms, Diviſions, 'or Rents in the Body, is, when any Member 'aſſumes another place than is allotted it, or 'being gone from the Life and Unity of the Bo- 'dy, and loſing the Senſe of it, lets in the Mur- 'murer, the Eye that watches for Evil, and 'not in holy Care over its Fellow-members; 'and then, inſtead of coming down to Judg- 'ment in it ſelf, will ſtand up and Judge its 'Fellow-members, yea, the whole Body, or 'thoſe whom God has ſet in a more Honoura- 'ble and Eminent place in the Body than it ſelf; 'ſuch ſuffer not the Word of Exhortation, and 'term the Reproofs of Inſtruction (which is 'the Way of Life) Impoſition and Oppreſſion, 'and are not aware how far they are in the 'things they condemn others for, while they 'ſpare not to reprove and revile all their Fel- 'low-members; yet if they be but admoniſhed 'themſelves, they cry out as if their great Char- 'ter of Goſpel-liberty were broken. And in p. 25. ſpeaking of the ſame ſort, he ſays, 'Such as are heady and high-minded, are in- 'wardly vexed that any ſhould lead or rule but 'themſelves, and ſo it is the high thing in 'themſelves, that makes them quarrel with o- 'thers for taking ſo much upon them, pretend- 'ing a liberty, not ſinking down in the Seed to 'be willing to be of no Reputation for its ſake. 'Such, rather than give up their own Wills, 'will ſtudy to make Rents and Diviſions, not 'ſparing the Flock, but proſtrating the Repu-

'tation

'tation and Honour of the Truth even to the 'World, miniſtring to them an occaſion of 'Scorn and Laughter, to the hardening them 'in their Wickedneſs and Atheiſm. Had *R. B.* been now living, how could he have more exactly deſcribed and ſet forth *G. K*'s condition, than theſe words of his do?

There is but one thing more that I deſign to take notice of, in his *Nameleſs Bull*, before I go to his Liſt of Errors; and that is, that after thoſe *Floods of Infamous Reproaches*, he has caſt forth, in the moſt *virulent* terms, not only againſt divers particular Perſons, but the whole Yearly Meeting in general, whom he hath compared to the Church of *Rome*, the *Spaniſh Inquiſition*, and whatever his Malice could ſuggeſt likely to bring the greateſt *Odium* upon them, he hath the amazing Confidence to ſay, p. 9. *For all their Enmity, Hatred, Reproaches,* &c. *I return them love and good-will, Bleſſing for Curſing, Good for Evil,* &c. This argues in him ſuch a *deep-rooted Hypocriſie*, and ſuch a *ſeared hardneſs*, as is rarely found in the moſt Prophane of Men.

I come now to conſider his *Liſt* of the vile and groſs Errors (which in his Pamphlet called, *The true Copy of a Paper*, &c. p. 17.) he charges upon *G. Whitehead*, *J. Whitehead*, and *W. Penn*, to which he adds an *Et-cætera*; yet in the Introduction tells his Reader, *I deſign only to give thee at preſent, this ſhort Liſt of* theſe *Mens groſs and vile Errors.* If that was his deſign, only to expoſe *theſe three* Men, he ſhould not have added his *Et-cætera* to them, which has an unbounded

bounded extent. But he is in ſuch Confuſion, that he ſcarce knows his own deſign (ſave that, in general, it is to *defame*, and reak his Revenge upon all that ſtand in his way). For though he here ſays, I deſign only to give thee at preſent, *this* ſhort Liſt, yet in p. 23. of the ſame Book, he adds *another* Liſt, which he there calls, *An Additional Liſt to the former*, ſo little agreeing is he to himſelf.

In his Introduction, which is long, as he threatens a more full Account of Errors (which he ſays he reſerves to another Opportunity) (with a due and impartial Correcting of them: So he promiſes to publiſh ſomething like Corrections, upon his own Books alſo, and to do it impartially. But what impartiality may be expected from him in that caſe, may be gueſſed from his manner of propoſing it. The *Errors* he Objects to others, he calls *groſs and vile*, and *oppoſite to ſome of the Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity*, and theſe he *threatens* with a *due* and *impartial* Correction. But on his own he looks with a *more favourable* Eye, ſome *Explications*, and them *ſhort ones* too, and alſo *Emendations*, (where he ſees need) of ſome *Words* and *Paſſages* in his former Books, will ſerve his turn. *For upon a review, he freely acknowledges he has found ſome Paſſages and Words, that not only need ſome further Explanation, but even in ſome part an Emendation and Correction.* And from this free acknowledgment of his, he takes occaſion to extol *his own humility of Heart, and love to the Truth, and regard to the Salvation of Souls, that he can freely both acknowledge and correct his*

former Miſtakes. (But his pretended Humility *ſmells of Pride*, and an *Ambition* to rank himſelf among the *worthy Antients*; for he adds) *after the Example of ſome worthy Antients.* For what Argument is it of Humility of Heart, to make ſuch an Acknowledgment as he doth, who p. 18. ſays, *Upon the moſt impartial ſearch that I have made, I find not any cauſe to correct either my Judgment or Books, as touching any of the great Doctrines and Principles of the Chriſtian Religion; nor do I know that I am of another Faith in any one Principle of Chriſtian Doctrine, contrary to what I believed, ever ſince I went under the Profeſſion of a Quaker, ſo called. The words and paſſages generally, if not univerſally, that I find cauſe to correct, not being ſo much relating to the Truth of Principles of Chriſtian Doctrine, as to ſome places of Scripture unduly applyed, to prove, or defend things that were Truths, but did not really prove theſe Truths, either by expreſs words, or yet by any real, and true and proper Conſequence, or relative to ſome other Leſſer and more Circumſtantial Matters. But as to the Fundamental, and otherwiſe great Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, I thank my Gracious God, that I have been well Preſerved, and have not found any thing, in any of my former or latter Books, contradictory to any one Fundamental Doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith.* Thus he, in *favour* of himſelf, and then goes on to *aggravate* the ſuppoſed Errors of others. Which puts me in Mind of thoſe *Lamiæ*, (as the Ancients called them) who were ſaid to be Blind at home; but very quick-ſighted abroad. What ſhew of *Humility* is there, in the acknowledgment he here makes?

Nay,

Nay, doth it not rather ſavour of *Pride*, in taking an occaſion from thence, to boaſt of his own Soundneſs and Conſtancy. Beſides, if his *Errors* or *Miſtakes*, (as he *mincingly* calls them) be only in applying ſome places of Scripture unduly, to prove, or defend things that were Truth, but did not really prove thoſe Truths, or be relative to ſome other leſſer and more Circumſtantial Matters; and that he finds no cauſe to correct either his Judgment or Books, as touching any of the great Doctrines and Principles of the Chriſtian Religion; how comes he to introduce his feigned Acknowledgment with ſuch Pomp of words, as he doth, ſaying, *I thank Almighty God, that has not only given me to ſee them, but has given me that Humility of Heart, and Love to Truth, and Regard to the Salvation of Souls, that I can freely both acknowledge and correct my former Miſtakes?* Did the Salvation of Souls depend upon ſuch *little* and *circumſtantial* Matters, as he mentions? However, ſeeing he thought the Salvation of Souls was concerned in his acknowledging, and correcting his former Miſtakes, as he calls them; why did he not *really ſhew* his regard to the Salvation of Souls, by a *particular Enumeration* and Acknowledgment of thoſe Miſtakes and Errors of his, and a *Correction* of them? Why did he deferr this, and poſtpone it to another Opportunity (which he knew not whether he might ever have) and fall now upon the pretended Errors of others? If the Salvation of Souls be concerned in thoſe Errors, or Miſtakes, which he has formerly committed in his Books, how knows he but

ſome Souls may be *thereby loſt*, before he can get another Opportunity to warn them of his Errors? And then the Guilt thereof will lye upon him, and their Blood be required at his Hand. And therefore it had behoved him to have *begun at home*, and to have *ſwept his own Houſe clean*, and *cleared himſelf* firſt, and caſt the *Beam* out of his own *Eye*, (before he had medled with *Motes* in others) and removed thoſe *Blocks*, whatever they are, which he knew *himſelf had laid*, to the endangering the loſs of Salvation to Souls, for which, if any Soul ſuffer loſs thereby, himſelf muſt anſwer. But his not doing this; but inſtead thereof *falling upon others*, and expoſing the pretended Errors of others, ſhews that his *Malice and Enmity againſt them*, and his *deſire of Revenge* upon them, for giving forth Truths Teſtimony againſt him, was more forcible and prevalent with and upon him, and ſpurred him more eagerly on, than his pretended Love to Truth, and regard to the Salvation of Souls, could do. Hath he not in this trod exactly in the Hypocrite's ſteps, whom Chriſt reproved? *Mat.* 7. 3, 4, 5.

This he ſeems to have had a foreſight of, and fences, as well as he can (which is very poorly) againſt it. He ſays, p. 18. *If any ſhall judge it to be an Act of Prejudice, or* Malice *in me, thus to expoſe them, after due warning given in private to* moſt *of them, and after they have thus publickly diſowned me, I have this Comfort, that they judge amiſs of me, and that nothing of prejudice or malice hath moved me to this Undertaking, but love to Truth, and Men; and next to the Honour of God,*

the

the regard of my Chriſtian Name and Reputation, which theſe Men have ſought to ſlay, and by ſo doing, to expoſe me, and my Family to outward want, and neceſſity. By this it is evident, beyond all his *Gloſſes* to the contrary, that *Malice* and *Revenge* moved him to this Undertaking; for, if it had been true, that he ſays, that theſe Men, whom he thus Charges, had ſought to ſlay his Chriſtian Name and Reputation, or to cover him (as he ſuggeſts) with a Cloud of unjuſt Infamy; he might in a Chriſtian Spirit (had he had it) have vindicated his Name and Reputation, and blown away the Cloud of unjuſt Infamy (he ſpeaks of) if he could, without recharging them. For it is accounted amongſt Men, both unmanly and unfair, for any one to juſtifie himſelf, by recriminating another. But ſo far is this ſuggeſtion of his from being true, that the contrary is true; it is he that hath ſought to *ſlay their Chriſtian Name* and Reputation, by charging them with holding *groſs and vile Errors*, contrary to the Fundamental and Principal Doctrines of Chriſtianity. Whereas they have been very ſparing of him; and the Judgment of the Meeting concerning him, was delivered in no harſher terms than theſe, viz. *That he is gone from the bleſſed Unity of the peaceable Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and hath thereby ſeparated himſelf from the Holy Fellowſhip of the Church of Chriſt, and that whilſt he is in an unreconciled and uncharitable ſtate, he ought not to preach or pray in any of Friends Meetings, nor be owned or received as one of us*, &c. Nor can I ſee what ground he has to complain, that they have

ſought to expoſe him, and his Family, to outward Want and Neceſſity. Did he come among the Quakers for outward Advantages? Or hath his leaving the Quakers, and turning againſt them, that tendency to bring outward want and neceſſity upon him and his Family? If it has, and ſhould produce that effect, both he and his Family may *blame himſelf* for it, as the cauſe thereof: there is a Juſtice with God, that ſuch as have grown *fat* in his Service, and thereupon have grown *wanton*, or *quarrelſome*, and *kickt* againſt him or his, ſhould be reduced to there former *leanneſs*, which he has ſecret ways to effect: I have made an Obſervation on ſome in my time, that have been greatly Bleſſed, and Increaſed in the things of this World, after they have come to Receive and Walk in the Way of Truth; who afterwards going from it, and turning againſt it, have inſenſibly; as it were, Loſt what they had Gained, and been Reduced to a lower Condition in the World, than they were in at firſt. But to proceed,

Since he ſays, *Nothing of Prejudice or Malice hath moved him to this undertaking, but Love to Truth and Men*, &c. I ask, Why did he not then enter upon this Undertaking ſooner? How is it, that he charged not them with theſe Groſs Errors, till after they had (as himſelf obſerves) publickly Diſowned him? If Love to Truth and Men had moved him, that would have moved him before: But his Concealing thoſe things, till they had Diſowned him, and now bringing them forth immediately thereupon, manifeſtly ſhews that it was *Malice* and *Revenge* that

that moved him to it, not Love to Truth or Men. In his laſt Pamphlet, Called, *The Nameleſs Bull*, P. 8. He gives another Reaſon for his not Publiſhing theſe Errors ſooner, which perhaps he had not invented when he wrote the former; it is this, *Let none* (ſays he) *think ſtrange that I have not made this diſcovery of their groſs Errors till now, at leaſt ſo to expoſe them in Print, for I ſincerely declare that the worſt and groſſeſt ſort of their Errors, whom I now expoſe to publick view, I did not know they were guilty of them, or that they were to be found in their Books but of late Times; and after I had diſcovered them, to my own certain knowledge, I was willing to exerciſe Chriſtian Patience, if by any means they might have been perſwaded to have corrected them, having privately warned and admoniſhed* ſome *of them.* That this is but a *falſe pretence*, and *feigned excuſe*, I have many Reaſons inducing me to believe: For firſt, the Books he takes his pretended Errors out of, were written many Years ago, and ſome of them upon Controverſies ſo remarkable and noted, with reſpect either to the Matters therein handled, or the manner of handling them, that few thinking or inquiſitive Men in thoſe Times, but peruſed, and attentively conſidered them. So that, it would be hard for him to beget belief, that thoſe Books had eſcaped his peruſal at the firſt, tho' he ſhould ſay, (which is too formal a Speech with him) he *ſincerely declares* it. Beſides, how far he will extend thoſe words of his [*of late times*] or where he will bound them, I know not: But it is plain to me, from what himſelf

ſays in his late Book, called, *The true Copy of a Paper*, &c. p. 11. That he knew theſe pretended Errors which he now charges on *G. W. J. W.* and *W. P.* before he writ that other Book of his, called, *The Cauſleſs Ground*, &c. about a Year ago) becauſe he gives it as his Reaſon, why he did not, as adviſed by the Yearly Meeting, clear the Body of the People called Quakers, in that Book. Nay further, it ſeems he knew them before that Yearly Meeting in 1694. For he gives his Knowledge of their Errors as a Reaſon, why he could not expect Juſtice from them at that Meeting, againſt thoſe whom he had Charged in *America*. *What Juſtice*, ſays he, *could I expect, that theſe being the Leading Men at the laſt Yearly Meeting*, (*viz.* in 94.) *ſhould fairly or ſufficiently condemn thoſe Mens groſs Errors in* Penſylvania, *charged on them, when they themſelves are guilty of the ſame.* And indeed it is moſt probable, that he had Collected his Exceptions againſt theſe Friends, out of their Books, while he was in *America*; for in his *Cauſleſs Ground*, p. 9. he boaſts, That he had in readineſs to Print, A Collection of Teſtimonies out of Friends printed Books, to prove certain Articles that he had elſewhere propoſed, which ſhews he had been hunting and ſearching in Friends Books before that. Now if he knew theſe things long ago, which he now Charges, (which it is, at leaſt, very probable he did) how very falſe and inſincere is he, in ſaying, *I ſincerely declare I did not know them, but of late times*! But however he be in that, certain it is he is extreamly falſe in the Reaſon he gives

gives, why he did not publiſh them ſo ſoon as he did know them; which Reaſon he thus gives, *After I had diſcovered them*, ſays he, *to my own certain knowledge, I was willing to exerciſe Chriſtian Patience, if by any means they might have been perſuaded to have corrected them, having privately warned and admoniſhed ſome of them* (in his other Book he ſays, *moſt* of them). Firſt, I do not underſtand he hath privately warned or admoniſhed any of the three, Charged in his Liſt of Errors, for holding the Errors he has now charged on them, or that he gave any of them a Copy of thoſe Errors pretended. Secondly, It's manifeſt, his pretended forbearance, and exerciſe of Chriſtian Patience, in order to have perſuaded them to have corrected them, upon his pretended private Admonition, is but a *meer Flam*, without any thing of Truth and Sincerity in it; in as much as now that that Reaſon ceaſes, and (as himſelf expreſſes it) *they have now cut off all hope or expectation, that they will receive any Brotherly Advice from me, by this their moſt hoſtile way of appearing againſt me*; yet he hath not brought forth *all* his Charges againſt them, but pretends to have *more* Errors to charge them with, which he *reſerves* (he ſays, p. 17.) *to another opportunity*: and in p. 31. affirming that he *has divers other groſs and vile Errors wherewith to Charge* G. W. *and* W. P. he ſays, *But I ſhall keep theſe others to a further reſerve*; and in p. 8. of his *Nameleſs Bull*, ſays, *As I have occaſion, may further demonſtrate out of their own printed Books*. Now as this ſhews *he is not ſincere*, in alledging his Chriſtian Patience for the reaſon of his

his not discovering those pretended Errors sooner; so it also shews he is *not sincere neither*, in the Motives he gives for his doing it now, which are, *Love to the Truth, and the honour of it*; *and* Love to the Souls of *many ignorant Persons, whom* he suggests *they have blinded and darkned, and led into these gross Errors, to the great danger of the Salvation of their Souls, that they might be undeceived.* If there were any Truth in this, why did he not now, together with these, bring forth and lay open the rest of his pretended Errors, that he might thereby *at once*, and *with the sooneſt*, have *fully cleared* Truth, and *fully secured* those ignorant and deceived Persons from the danger he surmises of their losing the Salvation of their Souls. Neither Love to Truth, nor to the Souls of Men, prevailed with him, so long as he could keep the stroke from off himself; while he had any hopes of that, he could keep all these gross and vile Errors close in his own Breast, whatever became of the Honour of Truth, or the Salvation of Mens Souls. But when once it came to that, which he calls their hostile way of proceeding against him, that is, that the Meeting gave Testimony against him, then *Enmity rose in him* against them, and a strong desire to be *revenged upon them*; and that *constrained* him thus to appear, which he would deceitfully *cloak* and *cover* under the Name of Love to Truth, and to the Souls of Men. Now let us see what these gross and vile Errors are wherewith he Charges them.

To usher in his Charges, he premises. p. 10. That *All sincere Christians believe, that by that Bloody*

Bloody Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, through Faith in him, they are cleansed from their sins; and that, by the Blood of Christ, by which true Believers are said both to be justified and sanctified, is to be understood the real and true Blood of Christ's Body that suffered on the Cross. To which I say, Unless he were a more sincere Christian, than of late he hath appeared to be, I do not think him a competent Judge of the Faith of *all* sincere Christians. But if he would needs take upon him to set forth what *all* sincere Christians believe, he should have explained what he means by those general words of his [*that Bloody Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross*] whether (with some of our former Opposers, upon whose old Cavils he seems to build his new ones) he means the suffering only of the outward Body upon the Cross; or whether he includes in that suffering Christ's pouring forth his Soul unto the Death, and his Soul suffering made an *Offering* for sin, *Isa.* 53. 10, 12. His giving his Life a *Ransom* for many, *Mat.* 20. 28. *Mark* 10. 45. which *G. K.* himself (when he was more himself, though not so much acted by self) said was *more than the visible Flesh*, and that *therefore somewhat more than the visible Flesh, is the Ransom and offering, by which Life of Christ we are saved*, said he, when he undertook (about Fifteen Years ago) to Correct the Rector of *Arrow*. See his Book, called, *The Rector Corrected*, p. 21. And in p. 20. of the same, he said, *Though Christ's Soul did not die; yet he suffered in his Soul, and that more heavily than the visible Flesh could suffer; so that, before he was Crucified, he said,*

My

My Soul is exceeding heavy unto death: And that these sufferings of his Soul are called the Travel of his Soul, Isa. 53. 11. So also he should have told us, whether by those other words of his, (*By the Blood of Christ, by which true Believers are said both to be justified and sanctified, is to be understood the real and true Blood of Christ's Body that suffered on the Cross*) he means only the *Blood* of the *outward* Body, (which was let out of Christ's Side by the Souldier's Spear, and was visible to the outward Eye) abstracted from, and exclusive of that Spiritual Blood, which Christ spake of, when he said (before his Death) *He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life*, &c. John 6. 54. And, *he that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*, Ver. 56. For the including or excluding of that Blood, makes a great [illegible] in his Proposition. And since he lays down that Proposition of his, of what all sincere Christians believe, in order to prove *G W.* and others, guilty of holding gross and vile Errors, he should have been plain, full and express therein.

The Charge he hereupon exhibits against *G. W.* is, That *G. W. calleth the real and true Blood of Christ's Body that suffered on the Cross, visible and material Blood, and that he positively denieth that the Saints are cleansed by that Blood.* This he pretends to take out of a Book of *G. W's*, called, *The Light and Life of Christ within*, printed in the Year 1668. in Answer to *W. Burnet*, a Baptist Teacher. Now it is to be noted, that those Cavilling *Baptists*, with whom

whom *G. W.* had then to do, did lay the whole ſtreſs of Juſtification, Sanctification, and Cleanſing from Sin, upon the *ſhedding* of the Blood of that *Outward Body* that ſuffered on the Croſs, in oppoſition to the Light and Liſe of Chriſt in Men, and excluding the Spiritual Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt before-mentioned. And if *G. W.* did call that outward Blood, which came out of that outward viſible and material Body, which was pierced with a viſible and material Spear, viſible and material Blood, and that with reſpect to the time when it was ſhed, what Error I pray is there in that?

Then whereas *G. K.* chargeth *G. W.* that *he poſitively denieth that the Saints are cleanſed by that Blood*, I have read over all the pages which he quotes of that Book, *viz.* p. 38, 39, 59, 60. and do not find any poſitive *denial* thereof, either in any of thoſe Pages, or any where elſe in that Book: neither hath *G. K.* ſet down in what words *G. W.* hath poſitively denyed it: which, if he would have been a fair Adverſary he ought to have done: Beſides, ſince thoſe Apponents of *G. W.* as I noted before, held Juſtification, Sanctification and Cleanſing from Sin, to be wrought by the *Shedding* of that Outward Blood upon the Croſs, in opoſition to his Light within, they calling it *an uncertain Guide*, Excluding the Divine Vertue and Efficacy of the Spiritual Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, (which *Spiritual Fleſh*, G. K. in his Rector Corrected, p. 21. ſaith, *was Offered up together with the Viſible Fleſh*) what Error had it been in *G. W.* if he had on that account poſitively

denied

denyed it? for *G. K.* saith in his Rect. Cor. p. 25. *It is very plain by the words of Christ, that by his Flesh and Blood,* John 6. 50. 51. *he meaneth only Spirit and Life*; and p. 21. *this Life of Christ is more than the Visible Flesh, and therefore somewhat more,* says he, *then the Visible Flesh, is the ransom and offering, by which Life of Christ we are saved:* and a little lower in the same page, *Christ's giving his Flesh for the Life of the World, is more than to offer up his Visible Flesh upon the Cross.* And in p. 26. of the same, he saith, *And thus we do not divide Christ, nor his Flesh and Blood, although a distinction there is, betwixt that Flesh which he had from the Beginning (and which the Saints fed upon in all Ages from the Beginning, otherwise they could not have had Life in them) and that which he took upon him in the Virgins Womb.* If such a distinction there be, according to *G. K.* himself; how is it a Gross and Vile Error in *G. W.* to make that distinction and keep to it, and oppose those those Opposers that would Divide Christ, and Attribute that Great Work only to the Outward Flesh and Blood which belongs to both? *G. W.* Denyed not the Vertue or Efficacy of that Outward or Visible and Material Blood, as it was a part of the Sacrifice, which Christ offered to his Father, for the Redemption of Mankind: But only opposed them that would appropriate the whole Vertue and Efficacy of the whole Sacrifice to that part of it only, excluding the rest. And therefore in this, *G. W.* is not guilty of gross or vile Error: But *G. K.* is guilty of grossly and vilely wronging and abusing him, and declining his own Testimonies for Christ's Spiritual Flesh and Blood.

Not

Nor is he leſs injurious in ſaying *G. W. giveth divers Reaſons of his poſitive denial; all which* (he ſays) *are moſt falſe and abſurd.* For I doubt not but it will ſoon appear, that he hath moſt falſly and abſurdly urged thoſe Reaſons againſt *G. W.* He gives three; the firſt of which is, *Becauſe that Blood is not in being, giving for his Authority*, W. Burnet, *p.* 40. *of his* (Burnet's) *Book.* Now it is obvious to every Reader, (and therefore *G. K.* may not be ſuppoſed ignorant) that *G. W.* in urging againſt *Burnet*, that that Blood is not in being, did only argue *ad hominem*, from *Burnet*'s own Poſition or Conceſſion. For *Burnet*, it ſeems, in the 40th page of his Book, (which *G. W.* anſwered) *had ſaid*, that *that Blood was not in being*; with which ſaying of his *G. W.* often *gauls* him in his Anſwer, telling him, p. 42. *The Blood of Chriſt which juſtifieth, which purgeth the Conſcience, which cleanſeth from all ſin, and wherein he waſheth them that follow him, is ſtill in being.* So p. 52. *I ask, is it not a Spiritual, Supernatural Vertue, Power and Efficacy, that cleanſeth, ſaveth and juſtifieth? If it be; how then doth it proceed from the ſhedding of the Blood outwardly, (which ſhedding by the Souldier's Spear was a wicked Man's act) or from the Eſſence of the Blood, if it be periſhed, and be not in being, as it confeſt, (viz. by Burnet). And is it good Doctrine to ſay, that that Blood (or Life) which ſanctifies and juſtifies true Believers in all Ages, is not in being?* So again, p. 57. upon the Baptiſt's ſaying, *Though that Blood ſhed be not in being, yet the efficacy of that Blood is ſtill in being*: *G. W.* replied, *What efficacy?*

cacy? *Is it Natural or Spiritual? If Natural, then how is the Blood loſt, or not in being? And then where is the Spirit's Work? If the Vertue be Spiritual that ſaves and ſanctifies, &c. it never dies nor periſheth; neither was it derived from that which is not in being, nor was any corruptible thing its Original.* Herein *G. W.* argued *Dilemmatically.* And from all the fore-recited paſſages it is evident, that he did not argue from a *Theſis* of his own; but from the *Theſis* (or at leaſt *Hypotheſis*) of his Opponent, continually wounding him with his own Weapon, and ſhewing that, in laying the whole ſtreſs (as it were) of Salvation upon the Blood that was outwardly ſhed by the Spear, and yet ſaying, *That Blood is not in being, ſuo ſe jugulaverat gladio,* with his own Hand and Sword he had cut the Throat of his own Cauſe. Now *G. K.* in turning this upon *G. W.* and charging him that he gave this as his Reaſon, when he only brought it to ſhew that his Opponent did thereby contradict and confute himſelf, hath dealt very unfairly and falſly with him; and the rather, for that he ſaw this, and confeſſeth, p. 26. that this Argument of *G. W*'s *was but Argumentum ad hominem at moſt againſt* W. B.

Nor is he more excuſable in the Second Reaſon he gives as *G. W*'s, which is, *Becauſe the Blood that came out of Chriſt's Side, when pierced by the Spear, was not ſhed by Chriſt, the ſhedding of it was no Act of Chriſt, but of a wicked Souldier, and therefore not efficacious, or meritorious, for remiſſion of ſin, or cleanſing from ſin.* For though he gives this, as *G. W*'s Reaſon, yet he gives it not in *G. W*'s words, but in his own words, contrary

contrary to *G. W.*'s ſence. Neither hath he ſet forth the occaſion or cauſe of *G. W.*'s ſpeaking what he hath here miſreported: Which was thus, (as appears in that Book of *G. W.*'s, Cited by *G. K.* called, *The Light and Life of Chriſt within*, p. 64.) The Baptiſt, in Diſpute with *G. W.* ſaid, *You deny the ſhedding of the Blood upon the Croſs, that was let out by vertue of the Spear being thruſt into his Side, to be meritorious, or the meritorious Cauſe of Man's Juſtification* (which the Baptiſt held in the Affirmative). Here the meritorious Cauſe of Man's Juſtification was laid, not ſimply and diſtinctly upon the *Blood*, or the Blood *ſhed*, but upon the *Act* of *ſhedding* it; and that ſo highly, as to impute *Vertue* to the *Spear* by which it was ſhed. To this *G. W.* anſwering directly to the terms of his Opponent, ſaid, *The ſhedding of that Blood let out by the Spear, was an Act of a wicked Man, and the Spear an Inſtrument of Cruelty; which to lay the meritorious Cauſe, or ſtreſs of Juſtification upon, is falſe Doctrine.* Obſerve here, he did not ſay, to lay the meritorious Cauſe, or ſtreſs of Juſtification, *upon the Blood*, is falſe Doctrine (though if any one ſhould lay the meritorious Cauſe, or ſtreſs of Juſtification, upon that *only*, excluſive of the other parts of the Sacrifice, that would not be true Doctrine): But he ſaid. It is falſe Doctrine to lay the meritorious Cauſe, or ſtreſs of Juſtification, upon the *Act of ſhedding*, or letting out that Blood by the Spear, which was the Act of a wicked Man, and the Spear an Inſtrument of Cruelty. And he added a Reaſon of his ſo ſaying; *for there is a great difference*

(said he) *between Christ's Offering up himself by the Eternal Spirit, a Lamb without spot to God, and the Acts of wicked Men inflicted upon him; as it is said, by wicked Hands they put him to Death.* Hence it appears *G. W*'s words before-recited (answering directly to the Terms of his Opponents Proposition) did not relate to the *Blood it self*, but to the *Act of shedding*, and Instrument, by which it was shed. And therefore *G. K.* hath grosly *abused* him, both in *misreporting* his words, in his pretended Recital of them; and in urging that *G. W.* gave them as his Reason for his positive denial, that the Saints are cleansed by that Blood; *both which are untrue.*

Yet so shameless is *G. K.* that in his 23d page, under a *new* Head of *An Additional Last to the former*, reciting those words of *G. W*'s, (which I have given before) he makes thereon this Observation, *viz. Here not only he excludes the shedding of that Blood, but the Death of Christ, and all his Bodily Sufferings from being concerned in that Offering*; which is a false Consequence, and a malicious Inference, not deducible from those words; for his Death, and Bodily Sufferings, are *included* in those words of *G. W.*'s before-recited, *viz.* Christ's offering up himself by the Eternal Spirit, a Lamb without spot to God, who, as the Apostle says, Phil. 2. 8. *humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* And Christ himself says, *I lay down my* Life *for the Sheep*, John 10. 15. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my* Life, *that I might take it again*, Ver. 17. *No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self:*

ſelf: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This Commandment have I received of my Father, Ver. 18. Had the Offering been conſtrained and involuntary, that is, had he not laid down his Life of himſelf, but it had been taken from him by force againſt his Will, it would not have had that acceptance with the Father, that it had. But his Pure, Divine and Abſolute Reſignation of his Will to the Will of his Father, was that which endeared his Father's Love to him; *Therefore doth my Father love me*, (ſaid he) *becauſe I lay down my Life*, *Ver.* 17. This Offering up himſelf (and giving himſelf a Ranſom for all) included all his Sufferings, both inward and outward, and made it a *compleat* and perfect *Sacrifice*; in which his Blood was comprehended, and concerned, as well as his Fleſh, before his Side was pierced by the Spear. For he had pronounced that great word (*Conſummatum eſt*) it is finiſhed, had bowed his Head, and given up the Ghoſt, before his Side was pierced by the Spear. It is ſaid expreſly, that the Souldiers that brake the Legs of the Two Thieves which were Crucified with him, when they came to Jeſus, ſaw that *he was dead already*, and therefore brake not his Legs, but one of them with a Spear pierced his Side, *Joh.* 19. 32, 33, 34. Which as I do not believe to have been done by Chance, or at a Venture, but by a Divine Providence: So neither do I believe that it was done to compleat the Offering, as if without this it would have been *imperfect* or defective. But the Text gives the reaſon of it expreſly, Ver. 36. *For*

these things (to wit, the not breaking of his Legs, and the piercing of his Side) *were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A Bone of him shall not be broken: And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced*, Ver. 37. And whereas *G. K.* saith, *The Holy Scriptures attribute the making Peace betwixt God and us, to Christ by the Blood of his Cross, called so, because it was that Blood that was shed, when he suffered on the Cross.* I ask for that Scripture that says, It is called the Blood of his Cross, *because it was that Blood that was shed, when he suffered on the Cross.* Had Christ no Blood but what was shed when he suffered on the Cross? Or was no more of his Blood concerned in our Peace, but that which was actually shed? I acknowledge that the Holy Scripture attributeth the making Peace between God and us, *to Christ, by the Blood of his Cross*, Col. 1. 20. But that by the word (*Blood*) there, is meant *nothing else* but the *material* Blood that was in that *visible* and material *Body*; or that *no more* of that Blood, than was *shed by the Spear*; or that which was so shed, *only because* it was so shed, is called in Holy Scripture, The Blood of his Cross, requireth better proof than *G. K*'s bare saying so. *Wilson*, in his Christian Dictionary, (sixth Edition, printed in 1655.) on the words, (*Blood of Christ*) saith, 'The Death and 'whole Sufferings of Christ, is to be understood, 'one part of his Sufferings being put for all; 'Citing for instance, *Eph.* 1. 7. By whom we 'have Redemption through his Blood. And

'often,

'often, he ſays, in the *Romans* and *Hebrews*, 'and throughout *Paul*'s Epiſtles, is the Blood of 'Chriſt (one part of his Sufferings) put Sy-'nechdochically for the whole Sufferings, viſible 'and inviſible. Therefore, adds he, it is ab-'ſurd to ſtick to the Letter, concluding from 'thence, that Chriſt's outward viſible Sufferings 'were ſufficient. And he adds, becauſe the 'Bloody Sacrifice of the *Jews* figured Chriſt's 'Death; hence ſo much mention of Blood in 'the New Teſtament. And *G. K.* himſelf ſays here, p. 24. *Our bleſſed Lord's Obedience to the will of his Father, which was a moſt holy and perfect Obedience, in his moſt holy and perfect Reſignation, and Patience, in his exceeding Love, both to his Father, and alſo to Men, in his moſt profound Humility, and all other moſt excellent Virtues, That God did regard in his Sufferings chiefly, and that was ſo highly meritorious*, &c. *And though his Death, and Sufferings, and Blood, were all valuable, and precious in God's ſight, yet his Obedience was chiefly conſidered.* And whereas he ſays, *Chriſt's Obedience, Blood, Death and Sufferings, are jointly to be conſidered by us in that great Work of our Redemption:* I ſay, ſo they are, and not his outward Sufferings *only*, but his inward Suffrings alſo; his pouring out his Soul unto the Death, and his Soul being made an Offering for Sin (which *G. K.* formerly ſaid, was *an heavier Suffering than the viſible Fleſh could ſuffer*) and his giving his Life a Ranſom for many, (which *G. K.* formerly ſaid was *more than the viſible Fleſh*) I ſay, all theſe are jointly conſidered, and rightly and reverently regarded

and esteemed by us. And therefore *G. K.* doth very wickedly, in Sugg sting that *G. W.* undervalued Christ's Sufferings, Death and Blood, or denied them to be Meritorious, because he said, (as the Scripture saith) *by wicked Hands they put him to Death.* I am sure in a *wicked* Mind, and from a *wicked* Spirit, *G. K.* hath vented this *wicked* Slander.

And whereas he says, p. 24. *The Blood, and the shedding of it, is mentioned in Scripture, because he* (Christ) *could not be a true and proper Sacrifice, without his Blood had been shed, for without shedding of Blood there could be no remission.* It seems (seeing he speaks this with relation to that Blood which came out of Christ's Side, when the Souldier pierced him, after he was dead) as if he thought, Christ's Sacrifice could not have been true and proper, his Offering compleat and sufficient, unless the Souldier had pierced his Side: For (upon the Souldier's piercing the Side) he says, *Without shedding of Blood there could be no remission.* Where read he that? I do not find the Scripture says so. The Author to the *Hebrews*, I know, says, *Without shedding of Blood there is no remission*, Heb. 9. 22. But he speaks it (as I take it) with respect to the First Testament, which in the 18th Verse, he says was not dedicated (or purified) without Blood. Then describing the manner how *Moses* sprinkled the Tabernacle, People, *&c.* with Blood, Ver. 19, 20, 21. he concludes, *And almost all things are by the Law purged with Blood; and without shedding of Blood there is no remission*, Ver. 22. That is, by, or according to the Law, which

which he had ſo long been treating of. But in the next Verſe he adds, *It was therefore neceſſary, that the patterns of things in the Heavens ſhould be purified with theſe, but the Heavenly things themſelves with better Sacrifices than theſe.* And I might ask *G. K.* (as he formerly askt his Rector) *Why cannot Spiritual Blood be ſhed, as well as the Holy Spirit is ſaid to be ſhed?* Acts 2. 33. Tit. 3. 6. (*Rect. Correct.* p. 25.) However, the material Blood of the outward Body, was with and in that Body, offered up by Chriſt to his Father, when he laid down his Life of himſelf, before his Side was pierced: And beſide that Blood, which was let out of his Side by the Spear, and before the Side was pierced, it cannot be doubted but ſome of his Blood was ſhed, when his Hands and his Feet were pierced, by being nailed to the Croſs. The Efficacy and Vertue of which Blood, whether actually ſhed, or not ſhed, is ſo far from being undervalued or ſlighted by the Quakers, (as *G. K.* maliciouſly ſuggeſts it is) that it is truly owned, highly valued, regarded and eſteemed, by the People called Quakers, in general, and *G. W.* in particular, as a part of the Offering which Chriſt offered to his Father for the Redemption of Mankind. Yet not ſo, as to lay the *whole* or *chief* ſtreſs of Man's Redemption, Juſtification, Sanctification, Cleanſing from ſin, *&c.* upon that *outward Blood only*, much leſs upon the *act of ſhedding* ſome of it, by the Souldier's Spear, after he was dead. For we may not divide Chriſt, nor his Offering; nor aſcribe (with reſtriction) to a part (and that the out-

ward part too) what is due to the whole. For that Christ had Spiritual Flesh, as well as outward or visible, which he had from the beginning, and which was offered up together with the visible, *G. K.* himself (as I have noted before) hath asserted in his *Rector Corrected*, p. 21. quoting also *Cyrill*, or (as he says) some think *Origen*, on *Levit. lib.* 9. speaking thus; *Thou who art come unto Christ, the true High-priest, who by his Blood hath made God propitious unto thee, and hath reconciled thee to the Father, rest not upon the Blood of the Flesh; but rather look unto the Blood of the Word, and hear him saying unto thee, This is my Blood that shall be shed for you unto the remission of sins. He that is instructed in the Mysteries, knoweth the Flesh and Blood of the Word of God.* And a little after he Cites the same Author, saying, That *in Christ there was a Twofold Sacrifice*: And how that *he shed upon the Earth his material Blood; but that with the living Vertue of his Body, he sprinkled the Heavens.* Thus *G. K. Rect. Correct.* p. 28, 29. But quite contrary to the before-cited Authority, those Baptists (with whom *G. W.* had that Controversie in 1668.) were not at all for looking to the Blood of the Word (which they neither owned nor seemed to understand; for *Burnet* said, He was not a Saviour, as he was the Word, see the Light and Life of Christ within, p. 47.) but would have all to rest upon the Blood of the Flesh, and that too as *shed by the Souldier's Spear.* And because *G. W.* did therein oppose them, and argued against them from their own Principles (as I have shewed before) *G. K.* hath

thence

thence *maliciously* taken occasion to *slander* him, as denying the *Efficacy or Merit of that Blood, for Remission of sin.*

Much after the like manner he deals with him, in making up a third Reason in *G. W*'s Name, for his pretended positive denial that the Saints are cleansed by that Blood. Which third Reason *G. K.* hath formed in his Name thus, p. 19. *Because as the New Covenant is inward and spiritual, so is the Blood of the New Covenant, but so was not that material Blood; and the material Blood of the Beasts that were offered in Sacrifice under the Law, was not a Type of that material Blood that was shed upon the Cross, for that were to say, One Type was a Type of another.* These are not *G. W*'s words, but *G. K*'s own, which he gives as if they were *G. W*'s, and therein both *abuseth G. W.* and *deceives* his Reader. And as he hath not given *G. W*'s own words, so neither hath he given the right and true Sense of his words, nor the occasion upon which they were spoken, which was this; the Baptist had argued thus, *All things under the Law, in the Type, were purged with Blood, and this Blood was material Blood, and not Mystical: And that Blood that Christ shed in order to the effecting the Salvation of Man, must needs be visible and material Blood.* If by this the Baptist meant, that the Blood Christ shed for the Salvation of Man, was the Antitype of the Blood wherewith the things under the Law were purged (as may reasonably be supposed he did) then the force of his Argument is, That such as is the Type, such, must be the Antitype. If the Type be material,

and

and not myſtical, then muſt the Antitype be material alſo, and not myſtical. Thus I obſerve G. W. took him, and thereupon anſwered thus, p. 59. *Do but mark here what a ſad Conſequence he has drawn; as if one ſhould reaſon, that becauſe the Type was material, viſible, and not myſtical; therefore the Antitype, or Subſtance, muſt needs be material, and not myſtical. By this, all Myſteries, or Divine Things, are excluded from being either Spiritual, Antitype, or Subſtance: Whereas it was the Heavenly Things themſelves that are in Chriſt, in which conſiſts the ſubſtance and end of Types and Shadows. But to ſay, that material Blood was a Type of that which was material; this is to give the Subſtance no preheminence above the Type, (eſpecially if neither of them be myſtical, nor in being;* which was the Baptiſt's Opinion *) or like as if one ſhould ſay, One Type was a Type of another; as to ſay, Becauſe Circumciſion, which was a Type, was material, or outward, therefore the Circumciſion of the Spirit, which is the Antitype of it, muſt needs be outward too, and not myſtical, (which would be ſad Doctrine): And thus he might as well reaſon touching all other Types and Shadows under the Law, and the heavenly or good things to come, prefigured or ſhadowed by them; that becauſe the Prieſts under the Law, (at the outward Tabernacle and Temple) were Miniſters of outward or temporal Things, carnal Ordinances, Shadows, &c. Therefore thoſe good things to come, thoſe heavenly things which Chriſt was ſaid to be the High-Prieſt of, muſt needs be temporal, and not myſtical; which were abſurd to aſſert. Whereas both the heavenly and more perfect Tabernacle and Altar, with the heavenly*

heavenly Things, are all a Myſtery, and Spiritual. The Offering and Living Sacrifices are ſpiritual, the Paſſover ſpiritual; the Seed ſpiritual; the Bread, the Fruit of the Vine, the Oyl, the Fleſh and the Blood (which give Life to the Soul) yea, the Water and Blood, (which waſheth and ſprinkleth the Conſcience) are all ſpiritual and myſterious, as the New Covenant it ſelf is, which they belong to, and theſe things are known in. And this is the new and living way which Chriſt ſet open, through the vail of his Fleſh, Heb. 10. *Let them receive this who can.* This was *G. W*'s Anſwer; which thoſe Baptiſts who were in the Types, could not receive. But *G. K.* received this, (if not rejecting, or ſhewing diſlike to it, may be called receiving it) and it paſſed for good and ſound Doctrine with him, (at leaſt without contradiction from him) for theſe ſix or ſeven and Twenty Years paſt; and longer probably might have done, had not *G. W.* with the reſt of Friends, denied him, (as being out of the Peaceable Spirit of Jeſus Chriſt) upon which he is ſtirred up, in a revengeful Spirit, to ſlander, beſpatter, and falſly accuſe him. For in all this Anſwer, *G. W.* ſaith nothing againſt the material Blood, nothing derogatory from it, doth not undervalue it, or deny the Vertue and Efficacy of it; but ſhews the weakneſs and falſeneſs of his Opponent's Argument and Inference, in urging a Neceſſity, that becauſe Blood in the Type was viſible and material, and not myſtical: Therefore Blood in the Antitype muſt needs be ſo too. Whereas *G. K.* I ſuppoſe, will not ſay, that the Blood of that viſible and material Body,

which

which Chriſt took on him in the Womb of the Virgin, had *nothing of ſpirituality* in it, *no myſtical* ſignification or operation, ſince that Body was not conceived in or after the *ordinary* way of *Human* Generation, but by the Overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt.

Another Charge which *G. K.* makes out of the ſame Book, againſt *G. W.* is this, That he ſaid, *The Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype*, viz. *neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to* Jeruſalem, *either to Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood; knowing that neither the Righteouſneſs of Faith, nor the word of it, doth ſo direct*, Rom. 10. *True Copy*, p 19. Theſe words were in Anſwer to the Baptiſt, who ſaid, *The Quakers would be ſo far from directing Men to go to the material Temple, that they make it but a vain thing to look to* Jeruſalem, *to the Antitype of that Temple*, viz. *to Jeſus Chriſt, as he was there Crucified, or to that Blood that was there ſhed, for Juſtification.* To this *G. W.* anſwered, (Light and Life of Chriſt within, p. 38.) *The Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype*, viz. *neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to* Jeruſalem, *either for Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood.* So it ſhould have been Printed, the word (*to*) there, next before (Jeſus Chriſt) being, through miſtake, ſet inſtead of (*for*), which it ſhould have been; and in the Book which I have, I find it hath been ſo amended with a Pen. And the former part of the Anſwer ſhews it ſhould have been ſo; for there it is, the Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type *for* the Antitype, (mark, *for* the Antitype, not *to* the Antitype).

And

And as it is ſo there, (to the Type *for* the Antitype) ſo it muſt be here alſo, to the Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, *for* Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood. Now where lies the Error, the groſs and vile Error, in theſe words? Is it an Error to ſay, The Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype, that is, to the outward Temple, or yet to *Jeruſalem*, for Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood? Doth G. K. then hold, Men ſhould be directed to the Type for the Antitype? Would he have the Quakers direct or ſend Men to the outward Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, to find Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood? Does he think it is to be found there? Nay, does he think that that City *Jeruſalem*, without the Gate of which Chriſt ſuffered, or the outward Temple that then ſtood therein, are now to be found there? Or any where elſe? Doth he think, the Righteouſneſs of Faith, or the Word of it, doth ſo direct? The Apoſtle ſaith, *The Righteouſneſs which is of Faith ſpeaketh on this wiſe, Say not in thy Heart, Who ſhall aſcend into Heaven?* (That is, to bring Chriſt down from above) *Or who ſhall deſcend into the Deep?* (That is, to bring up Chriſt again from the Dead): And *Moſes*, to whoſe words *Paul*'s here refers, adds, *Who ſhall go over the Sea for us, to bring it unto us*? Deut. 30. 13.) *But what ſaith it? The Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart*, Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8. It was no Error in the Apoſtle *Paul* to direct (according to the Righteouſneſs of Faith) to the word Nigh, in the Mouth, and in the Heart; though he knew well enough that Chriſt had ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*, and that but a little before:

before: Yet he did not direct Men to the outward Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, (though both then ſtanding) to find Chriſt, or his Blood there. For he knew that Chriſt was not then to be found outwardly, either at the outward Temple, or at *Jeruſalem*; but they that came to the word nigh in the Mouth, and in the Heart, would both find Chriſt, and feel the Virtue of his Blood (even of that Blood which he offered upon the Croſs) nearer home. So neither is it any Error in *G. W.* to ſay, The Quakers ſee no need to direct Men to the Type for the Antitype, *viz.* neither to the outward Temple, nor to *Jeruſalem*, either for Jeſus Chriſt or his Blood: Nor in ſo ſaying doth he deny, or diſ-eſteem Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood, (for he directs, with the Apoſtle, where Men may both find Jeſus Chriſt, and may feel the Virtue of his Blood): But he rejects the Notion of his Opponent, who (it ſeems) would have Men directed to the Type for the Antitype.

And ſince G. *K.* is ſo forward now to fall in with our old Oppoſers the Baptiſts, and quarrel with *G. W.* for not directing Men now to the Type for the Antitype, to the outward Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, for Jeſus Chriſt or his Blood: It will not be amiſs to let him ſee, how flatly he therein contradicts himſelf in what he formerly writ, in his Book called *Help in time of need*, p. 63. where he ſaith expreſly thus; "And "now *we need not ſay*, Who will go down into the "Grave, and bring up Chriſt to us, or who will "aſcend to Heaven, to bring him down to us; "or who will go over the Seas, and bring us ti-

"dings

" dings of him *from Jeruſalem where he ſuffered in* " *the fleſh*; him (whoſe Name is the Word of " God, *Rev.* 19.) we of a Truth witneſs nigh " us, even in our hearts; ſo that we need not " either aſcend or deſcend, or go forth, *&c.* By this he may ſee how far he is degenerated and apoſtatized from his former Principles: Then he was not for aſcending, deſcending, or ſending to *Jeruſalem*, to have *Tidings* of Chriſt *brought from thence*; becauſe he then witneſſed him, Chriſt, the Word of God, nigh him, even in his heart: But now, being gone from the Word in his heart, and turned againſt it, he is (it ſeems) for having men directed to the Type, for the Antitype, to the outward Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, for Jeſus Chriſt, and his Blood.

His Clamour at *G. W.* in p. 24, *&c.* about ſome words of *S. Eccles*, concerning the Blood that was let out of the Side of Chriſt's Body after it was dead, is a meer malicious Cavil; for *G. W.* did not undertake to defend *S. E.* but ſhew'd what *S. E.* himſelf ſaid was his intention or meaning, in the words ſpoken by him, and excepted againſt. And yet ſaid, *I do not make* S. E's *Expreſſions therein (eſpecially as conſtrued by our Adverſaries) to be an Article of our Faith: For I own that in one ſenſe the Blood ſhed was more than that of another Saint*, &c. And though *G. K.* carps at thoſe words *(in one ſenſe)* and ſays, *He ſhould have owned it ſo in a manifold ſenſe*, &c. Yet he might have ſeen that in the Enumeration *G. W.* made, his own ſenſe comprehended *a manifold* ſenſe: But if he had owned it to be more, but in one ſenſe; that had

been

been enough to have secured him from any ſtroke from S. *E*'s words. And therefore, if S. *E.* did let fall any unjuſtifiable Expreſſion concerning that Blood that was forced out of Chriſt's Body by the Souldier's Spear, after he was dead, as that it was no more than the Blood of another Saint, (meaning, as he explain'd himſelf, as to the *Eſſence*, not the *ſpiritual virtue* thereof) *G. K.* did baſely and very enviouſly to caſt this upon *G. W.* who had both *diſclaimed* thoſe words; by ſaying, I do not make S. *E*'s Expreſſions therein an Article of our Faith; and had alſo for himſelf declared, that he did own the Blood ſhed to be more than the Blood of another Saint. And ſeeing S. *E.* in the ſame Letter, did *ſpeak highly in eſteem of the Blood of Chriſt, and New Covenant, as more excellent, and living, and holy, and precious than is able to be uttered*, (as in *G. W*'s Book is expreſſed, p. 58.) that ſhews he had *no light eſteem* of the Blood of Chriſt it ſelf, as it was made by Chriſt a part of that bleſſed Offering for Man; and that what he ſpake of that part of the Blood which was let out by the Spear, was with reſpect to the *Souldiers act*, and the time of doing it, which was *after his Death*; common Charity would have made an Ingenuous Adverſary have overlooked it, how weak ſoever he had look'd upon S. *E.* to have been therein.

Thus Reader, I have given thee an Account of the great and high Charges *G. K.* hath exhibited againſt *G. W.* of groſs and vile Errors, and how greatly he hath wronged and abuſed him therein: *By* which thou mayſt gueſs what thou art to expect

expect in his other Charges of like nature againſt *W. Penn*, into which let us now look.

The firſt (and I think the main) thing he charges on *W. P.* is, That (in a Book called *The Chriſtian Quaker, and his Divine Teſtimony Vindicated*, p. 97. which Book I wiſh every one would read) he ſaid, *This Seed*, (viz. the one Seed Chriſt) *muſt be inward and ſpiritual, ſince one outward thing cannot be the proper Figure or Repreſentation of another: Nor is it the way of holy Scripture ſo to teach us; the outward Lamb ſhews forth the inward Lamb; the* Jew *outward, the* Jew *inward.* Upon this he ſays, p. 19. *If this be not as plain a denial of Chriſt to be any outward being, having any bodily Exiſtence without us, I know no* Engliſh. For *a Scotchman* not to know *Engliſh*, is not ſo great a wonder, as it would have been, if he had ſaid he knew no *Scottiſh*. I believe he knows both: And yet (with his leave) let me tell him, this Sentence of his is not good Grammatical *Engliſh*: For to his Comparative Particle (*as*) he hath not ſubjoin'd another (*as*) to make his Compariſon compleat, but has begun a Compariſon, and left it *unfiniſhed*; ſaying, If this be not *as plain* a denial, *&c.* but does not ſay, *as what*. But of this, a Touch only by the by; nor, would I have touched it at all, had he not led me to it, by boaſting of his Knowledge of *Engliſh*.

To the Charge it ſelf, I ſay, The Scope and Deſign of *W. P.* in thoſe words was, to prove againſt his Opponents, that the Son of God, who, in the fulneſs of time, took upon him a Body of Fleſh, in which he ſuffered on the Croſs, was, and was properly called, Chriſt,

before he appeared in that outward Body; which his Opponents denied, not owning Chriſt, as Chriſt, to have had any Exiſtence before that Body which was Born of the Virgin, but confining Chriſt to that Body. And becauſe all acknowledge the promiſed Seed to be Chriſt, *W. P.* uſed that as a *Medium*, to prove, that Chriſt was Chriſt before that outward Appearance. Now his affirming Chriſt to be the Seed, and that Seed to be inward and ſpiritual, is not a denial of Chriſt's having a Bodily Exiſtence without us; for he may have, and hath, a Bodily Exiſtence without us, and yet may be, and is, ſpiritually in us. 'Tis true, he denied that that Body which Chriſt had from the Virgin, *ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch*, was the Seed; and he gave divers Reaſons for it, which *G. K.* not being able to anſwer, calls *Antichriſtian*; yet himſelf is forced to grant, p. 20. that *the Body of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, is not the Seed of the Woman, nor the Soul, or whole Manhood of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, without the Godhead.* Was it then an Error in *W. P.* to ſay, Chriſt's Body, or what he had from the Virgin, *ſtrictly conſidered*, was not the Seed? He did not deny the Manhood of Chriſt glorioufly united with the Godhead, to be the Seed that was promiſed ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head, *Gen.* 3. 15. But he held, that that Seed, being of a Divine and Spiritual Nature, did inwardly work againſt the Serpent, and did bruiſe his Head, and break his Strength and Power, in ſome meaſure, in the Holy Men and Women in all Generations, before that viſible Appearance of Chriſt

Chriſt in that Body of Fleſh which he took of the Virgin. And although that Divine Seed, which was promiſed to bruiſe the Serpent's Head, is called the Seed of the Woman: Yet in as much as (according to *G. K.*) it is *the Godhead and Manhood jointly conſidered, and moſt gloriouſly united, that is the Seed of the Woman*; and ſince the chief Excellency, Nobility and Dignity lies in the Godhead; and what the Manhood partakes thereof, is derived from the Godhead thereunto, by the glorious Union it has therewith; I ſee not why that holy Seed may not be called, *The Seed of God*, as well as *the Seed of the Woman*. And although it pleaſed the Divine Wiſdom, when upon Man's Fall, he promiſed Chriſt, the reſtoring Seed, to denominate him *the Seed of the Woman*, with reſpect to his fore-determined Purpoſe, that in the Fulneſs of Time, he ſhould take on him Fleſh in the Womb of a Woman, and be made in the *likeneſs of Men*, that ſo he might bruiſe the Serpent's Head, break his Strength, ſubdue his Power, vanquiſh him, and triumph over him *in that Form* and Bodily Appearance, or Similitude of ſinful Fleſh, *Rom.* 8. 3. in which Man had been tempted and overcome by the Serpent. Yet none, I hope, think, from his being called the Seed of the Woman, that he had not a Divine Exiſtence and Being, before he appeared in that Body of Fleſh which he took, in the Virgin's Womb; or that he received the Power, Might, Strength and Ability, by which he overcame the Serpent, from the Virgin, or any thing he took of or from her; who her ſelf, no

doubt, felt that Holy Seed, as a Principle of Divine Light, Life and Power, working inwardly and ſpiritually in her Heart, before her Womb was impregnated, by the overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt. *G. K.* himſelf confeſſes, p. 20. That *the Seed did, in good meaſure, bruiſe the Serpent's head, in the holy Men and Women of all Generations, before that outward Appearance*, (which was *W. P*'s Aſſertion): But he denies the Conſequence, and calls it *a notorious Falſhood, and a moſt Antichriſtian Doctrine, that therefore the Seed* (he puts in, of the *Woman*, and of *Abraham*; neither of which Terms were uſed by *W. P.* but either ſimply, *The Seed*, or the Seed of the *Promiſe*) *was not any outward Thing or Perſon, but an holy and ſpiritual Principle of Light, Life and Power.* But ſince he grants, this Seed did bruiſe the Serpent's Head in the holy Men and Women of *all* Generations, *before* that outward Appearance of Chriſt in the Fleſh, (which was ſome Thouſands of Years after the Seed was promiſed) I would gladly know of him, what *outward Thing*, or *Perſon*, was that Seed, all that time; and whether it was not an holy and ſpiritual Principle of Light, Life and Power; and as ſuch did bruiſe the Serpent's Head in the Hearts of Men and Women? He ſays, *Chriſt did not become the Seed of the Woman, according to the ſenſe of that place of Scripture*, Gen. 3. until *the fulneſs of time, that he was made of a Woman.* How well this agrees with his former Doctrine, we ſhall ſee anon: Mean while he will not deny, I hope, that *Chriſt* was the *Seed* promiſed, *Gen.* 3. from that very moment wherein the Promiſe

was

was made; and that the Promiſe immediately began to take effect, by his ſpiritual Operation, as a Seed or Principle of Light, Life and Power, in the Heart, bruiſing the Serpent's Head there, not only before he himſelf, as Man, was made of a Woman, in the fulneſs of time; but even in the Heart of that firſt Woman [*Eve*] before there was any Seed of the Woman naturally Born into the World.

This *G. K.* himſelf both knew and taught once, before *Pride* and *Envy* made him run *retrograde*: For thus he formerly writ of it, in a Book of his, called, *The Way caſt up*, Sect. 8. wherein he aſſerts, p. 93. That *Jeſus Chriſt was the true Chriſt of God, before he took Fleſh, and before he was the Son of* Mary, &c. *For* (ſays he there) *his being Born of the Virgin* Mary *made him not to be Chriſt, as if he had not been Chriſt before; but he was Chriſt before, even from the beginning, as* (ſays he) *I ſhall prove clearly out of Scripture*, &c. And having brought divers Scriptures, and Arguments, from p. 93. to p. 99. to prove that Chriſt Jeſus, *as Man*, was from the beginning, and had from the beginning an heavenly *Manhood*, and ſpiritual *Fleſh and Blood*; he there concludes thus, *This is the promiſed* Seed, *which God promiſed to our Parents after the Fall, and* **actually gave unto them**, *even* **the Seed of the Woman**, *that ſhould bruiſe the Head of the* Serpent. *And therefore, though the outward Coming of the Man Chriſt was deferred, according to his outward Birth in the Fleſh, for many Ages; yet from the beginning this heavenly Man, the promiſed* Seed, *did inwardly come into the hearts*

of those that believed in him, and bruised the Head of the Serpent, &c. Here he not only asserts that this heavenly Man, Christ, was the promised Seed, and did from the beginning inwardly come into the Hearts of Believers, and bruised the Head of the Serpent; but also calls him, *The Seed of the Woman*; and says, God not only promised him, but *actually gave him*, even *the Seed of the Woman*, (that should bruise the Serpent's Head) *unto our Parents after the Fall, many Ages before his outward Birth in the Flesh.* Surely, he that writ this, had no cause to quarrel with *VV. P.* for saying, Christ's Body, or what he had from the Virgin, strictly considered as such, was not the Seed of Promise. He had more need to have reconciled himself to himself (if he could) in these two opposite Expressions of his, *viz.* [That *God gave the promised Seed, even the Seed of the VVoman, actually to our Parents after the Fall, many Ages before his outward Birth in the Flesh*]: *VVay cast up*, p. 99. And (That *Christ did not become the Seed of the VVoman, according to the sense of* Gen. 3. *until the fulness of time, that he was made of a VVoman*). *True Copy of a Paper*, p. 20. And he should have done well to have informed his Reader, how God did actually give unto our Parents after the Fall (so many Ages before Christ's outward Birth in the Flesh) the Seed he promised them, *Gen.* 3. even the Seed of the Woman: And yet Christ not be the Seed of the Woman, according to *Gen.* 3. until so many Ages after he was actually given, as the Seed of the Woman.

And in his Appendix to his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, p. 256. ſpeaking of the Spiritual Generation and Birth of Chriſt in us, he ſays, 'Thus we become the Mother of Chriſt in a ſpi-'ritual ſenſe, or according to the Spirit, as the 'Virgin *Mary* was his Mother after the Fleſh. 'And this ſpiritual Myſtery Chriſt himſelf did 'Teach in the Days of his Fleſh, when he ſaid, '*Whoſoever ſhall do the will of my Father which is* '*in Heaven, the ſame is my Brother, and Siſter,* '*and Mother*, Mat. 12. 50. *And thus* (ſays *G.* '*K.*) *Chriſt, according to his ſpiritual Birth in the* 'Saints, *is the* Seed *of the Woman*; for that the 'Saints are the Woman that bring him forth 'after the Spirit, and are his Mother; as *Ma-*'*ry* brought him forth after the Fleſh, and after 'the Spirit alſo; ſo that ſhe was the Mother of 'Jeſus in a double reſpect; for as ſhe brought 'him forth in her Body, ſo ſhe brought him 'forth in her Soul, otherwiſe he could not have 'been her Saviour, *&c.* Here *G. K.* calls *Chriſt, the* Seed *of the Woman, according to his ſpiritual Birth in the* Saints, and yet quarrels with *W. P.* for ſaying, The Seed, Chriſt, muſt be inward and ſpiritual.

Again, In *the Way caſt up*, p. 102. he ſays, *And indeed, ſeeing he* (Chriſt) *is called as really Man, before his outward Birth in the Fleſh, as afterwards, we have as good cauſe to believe him to be true and real Man, before his outward Birth in the Fleſh, as after. For it is not the outward Fleſh and Blood, that is the Man* (*otherwiſe the Saints that have put off the outward Body, ſhould ceaſe to be* Men, *and Chriſt ſhould have ceaſed to be*

Man, betwixt his Death and his Reſurrection) *but it is the* Soul, *or inward* Man, *that dwelleth in the outward Fleſh or Body, that is the* Man *moſt properly, ſuch as Chriſt was even from the beginning. And therefore,* (adds he, p. 104.) *let all the* Scriptures *be ſearched, and it ſhall not be found that Chriſt became Man, and took to himſelf the Soul of Man, at his Conception in the* Womb *of the* Virgin Mary; *but* only *that he took Fleſh, and was the Son of* Mary, David *and* Abraham, *according to the Fleſh. But, according to his heavenly Nature, even as Man, he was the Son of God, and was the Father and Lord of all the Faithful in all Ages,* &c. What can be more contrary to what he now delivers?

He goes on now thus, *Though Chriſt did not become the Seed of the* Woman, *according to the ſenſe of that place of Scripture,* Gen. 3. *until the fulneſs of time, that he was made of a* Woman, *yet ſeeing that Divine Power, that inwardly did deſtroy the Power of* Sin, *and* Satan *in true Believers, in him that was promiſed to come; was the real Power of him, that was to come, and the Gift of it, was the real Purchaſe of his moſt holy and perfect Obedience unto Death, when he came; it is truly ſaid, That he bruiſed the* Serpent's *Head in all true Believers in all Ages.* This is ſo obſcure a paſſage, and ſo intricately worded, that, though I underſtand *Engliſh* pretty well, I do not well know how to underſtand this, unleſs he means, that Chriſt, *as he was Man,* made of a Woman in the fulneſs of time, did bruiſe the Serpent's Head in true Believers in all Ages, *before he was Man* made of a Woman. And that the Gift of

the

the Promiſed Seed was *not a free Gift*, or did not proceed from *the free Love* of God to Man, (contrary to *John* 3. 16. where Chriſt Jeſus himſelf ſays, *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life*) but was the real Purchaſe of Chriſt's moſt holy and perfect Obedience unto Death, when he came. Which how well it ſounds, let thoſe who have a ſpiritual Ear open, judge. It is ſufficient to my preſent purpoſe, that he hath granted enough to *take off his Charge* againſt *W. P.* in acknowledging, *That Chriſt, the promiſed Seed, did bruiſe the Serpent's Head in all true Believers in all Ages; and that the Body which Chriſt took from the Virgin, ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch, was not the promiſed Seed*: Which was the groſs and vile Error he charged *W. P.* with, and made ſuch an hideous Clamour about. What is now become of it? Where's the groſs and vile Error? Was it not, that *W. P.* ſaid, The Seed, Chriſt, muſt be inward and ſpiritual; that it bruiſed the Serpent's Head in the holy Men and Women of all Generations, and that Chriſt's Body, or what he had from the Virgin, *ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch*, was not the Seed? And doth not *G. K.* ſay the ſame? Namely, *That it is truly ſaid, He bruiſed the Serpent's Head in all true Believers in all Ages*, p. 21. and that the Body of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, is not the Seed of the Woman, p. 20. Well, what *ſhift* has this *ſhifter* left? But one, that I find, and that truly a very ſorry one, p. 20. *viz.* That W. P. *by limiting the Queſtion, by the Phraſe (ſtrictly con-*

considered) *fighteth against his shadow*: *For* (says he) *I know no Baptist that ever said, the Body strictly considered*, i. e. *without the Soul of the Man Christ*, &c. *is Christ*, *or that promised Seed of* Abraham, *and Seed of the Woman*. But First, If this be true, that he knows no such Baptist, what then? Doth it therefore follow, that there was no such? Is he such a **Know-all**, that nothing can be, but what he knows? He had best have a care he doth not run himself upon a *Dilemma*: For there is one just before his Nose, and that's this; That if he was not acquainted with that Controversie, which *W. P.* handled in that Book, called the *Christian Quaker*, (out of which he has formed his *deformed* Charge against him) he doth but *prevaricate* and dissemble, in saying, He knows no Baptist that ever said so, *&c.* Or, if he was acquainted with that Controversie, then either what he hath now charged on *W. P.* as *gross and vile Error*, was good and sound Doctrine with him till of late; or he hath told a most horrible *Untruth*, and that with high Dissimulation and Hypocrisie, in saying, in his *Nameless Bull*, p. 8. *I sincerely declare, that the worst and grossest sort of their Errors, whom I now expose to publick view, I did not know they were guilty of them, or that they were to be found in their Books, but of late Times.* But, now I think on't, *G. K.* himself was *personally* concerned in that Controversie, being present at those Disputes Friends had with those Baptists, and others, at *London*: And that renders his *pretended sincere* Declaration, the more justly suspected of *Insincerity*.

cerity. But Secondly, Suppoſe no Baptiſt, or other, had ſaid ſo; and that therefore *W. P.* had fought againſt his own ſhadow, as *G. K.* ſurmiſes he did: Would that have made him guilty of groſs and vile Errors? I never heard before that it was a groſs and vile Error, deſtructive to the very Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, for a Man to fight againſt his ſhadow. But if it be ſo, I pity *G. K.* of moſt Men, who, as much as moſt Men, fights againſt his own ſhadow. For it is indeed but his own ſhadow he hath been all this while fighting againſt, while he pretended to fight againſt G. W. and W. P.

Yet ſo vain and fooliſh is he, and puffed up in his own Conceit, that though he hath com'd thus poorly off, he breaks forth into this *inſulting ſcoff*, p. 21. *And thus*, ſays he, *having ſhewed the Antichriſtian Doctrine of theſe two great Champions, that have appeared againſt me, to give out this Nameleſs Bull of Excommunication*, (There he has more plainly ſhown the falſneſs of his Nature, after his demure pretences, p. 18, 19. That *nothing of Prejudice or Malice had moved him to this Undertaking, but love to Truth and Men, and the honour of God*, &c. Whereas now he hath as good as told us it is, becauſe they have appeared againſt him, to give out, as he calls it, a Nameleſs Bull of Excommunication) *I ſhall in ſhort*, (adds he) *preſent to the Reader's view the Antichriſtian Doctrine of the Third Champion*, John Whitehead, *not only contradicting the plain Doctrine of the holy Scripture, in a Fundamental Article of Faith, but alſo contradicting his*

Brother

Brother W. Penn. Now let us see what this Antichristian Doctrine is; and then consider, 1. Whether it contradicts the plain Doctrine of the holy Scripture, in a Fundamental Article of Faith. And, 2. Whether it contradicts W. P. *John Whitehead*'s Doctrine, he pretends to take out of p. 40, 41. of a Book, called, *The Quakers Refuge*, printed in the Year 1673. (22 Years ago) and he gives his words thus, *That Christ hath a Body, or is in a Body, suitable to his Spirit, consisting of heavenly Flesh and Bone*: This, I hope, is no Antichristian Doctrine; If *G. K.* thinks it is, let him shew wherein. He adds, *That* J. W. *doth not deny that Christ hath any Body now beside his Church.* In that J. W. is not condemnable, but commendable: For that I am sure is no Antichristian Doctrine. He adds further, That J. W. *confesseth he hath several times denied, That Christ hath now a Body of Flesh and Bones circumscript, or limitted in that heaven which is above, and out of every* Man *on earth.* Here he wrongs J. W. for the words of J. W. in the Book and Page before-mentioned, are, *I have several times denied* T. G's *Assertion*, (this *T. G.* was one *Thomas Grantham*, whom I take to be a Baptist Teacher, with whom J. W. had had several publick Disputes) wherein *T. G.* affirmed, *That Christ hath now a Body of Flesh and Bones circumscript, or limitted in that Heaven which is above, and out of every* Man *on Earth.* And says J. W. *perceiving that he stood conceited in his fleshly Apprehension and Knowledge, wherein he had conceived the Lord of Glory to be like unto corruptible* Man, *I asked him, Since he denied Christ*

to

to be in *and with Believers whilſt upon Earth, where that Body was he ſpake of, and how big, or what an one it was? To which he anſwered in his haſte, That it was ſuch an one as his, conſiſting of Fleſh and Bones, and in yonder heaven which is above, pointing towards the Clouds*; (who told him, *Nay; thy Fleſh is ſinful, and corruptible, and rottenneſs ſhall enter into thy Bones; neither can thy Body come in, the Doors being ſhut, nor appear in another form, as Chriſt did.*) And though *T. G.* being driven out of that by J. W. did amend his words, and except Sin and Corruption, in comparing Chriſt's Body to his own: Yet I do not find he made any diſtinction in the Compariſon, between his *Earthly* Body, and Chriſt's *heavenly* and glorious Body, conſiſting of *heavenly* Fleſh and Bones. By which it appears what ſort of Body it was that J. W. denied Chriſt now to have, and upon what occaſion he denied it, to wit, *ſuch a Body as* T. G. *had, which was earthly, and not glorified*, nor ſpiritual. But J. W. had before declared, That *Chriſt is glorified with that Glory which he had with the Father before the world began, in a Body ſuitable to his Spirit, conſiſting of heavenly Fleſh and* Bone; which is true Chriſtian Doctrine. And *G. K.* hath not ſo much as attempted to ſhew, wherein J. W's Doctrine, in any part of it, is Antichriſtian, or contradictory to the plain Doctrine of the holy Scripture: Nor hath he brought any Doctrine of the holy Scripture, or any Fundamental Article of Faith, to oppoſe J. W's Doctrine with. But mentioning another ſaying of his, *viz. That whereſoever the Spirit and Life of Chriſt is, it is in*

the

the Body of Christ (which J. W. alledged to shew that the Spirit and Body of Christ are not divided;) he makes this Observation on the whole; *And thus, as he* (J. W.) *owneth that Christ hath a Body that is not the Church, yet he owneth no other Body* (*besides his Church*) *that is Circumscript, and out of every Man on Earth.* He should have added to Circumscript (*or limitted in that heaven which is above*): For so *T. G*'s Assertion stands, That Christ hath now a Body of Flesh and Bones Circumscript, or limitted in that Heaven which is above; not only limitted *to* Heaven, but limitted also *in* Heaven. If to deny that Christ hath now such a Body, as the Baptist said he had, and so Circumscribed, or limitted in that Heaven above, as the Baptist said it was, be an Antichristian Doctrine, contradicting the plain Doctrine of the holy Scripture, and that in a Fundamental Article of Faith, G. K. should have shew'd it, as well as said it: Hitherto he has only said it, but has not so much as attempted to shew it, though he said he would *present it to the Readers view.* He added indeed, that he would do it *in short*; but instead of doing it *in short*, he hath *fallen short* of doing it at all.

It had been more Prudence in G. K. before he had fallen thus *rudely* on J. W. for denying that Christ hath now a Body of Flesh and Bones Circumscript, or limitted in that Heaven which is above, and out of every Man on Earth, to have considered, that he himself had blamed the Presbyterian and National Church, for confining (which is limitting) Christ to some particular

ticular place. Theſe are his words, in *The Way caſt up*, p. 63. *And although ſhe falſly accuſe us, as denying the true Chriſt, yet I hope to make it apparent, that ſhe, and not we, are the deniers of him, who would exclude him out of the very Saints, and altogether confine him to ſome particular place.* What odds, I pray, between the Preſbyterians *confining* him to ſome particular place, ſo as to *exclude* him out of the very Saints: And the Baptiſts *limiting* him in Heaven, and out of every Man on Earth? And if he could charge the Presbyterians with denying Chriſt, by their ſo confining him; will he, without bluſhing, blame *J. W.* (and that ſo highly) for denying the Baptiſts limitation of Chriſt? If he ſhall think to ſhift it off, by ſaying, The one paſſage was ſpoken of *Chriſt*; the other, of his *Body*: Beſide that he would thereby *divide* Chriſt from his Body, I ſhall put him in mind of what himſelf hath writ of the Body, in the ſame Book, (*Way caſt up*, p. 131.) where ſpeaking of that Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*, *and is now aſcended and glorified in Heaven*, he ſays, Which *remaineth the ſame in ſubſtance, that it was on Earth, although it be wonderfully changed, as to the mode and manner of its being; it being* (mark this) *no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but a pure,* Ethereal, *or Heavenly Body, like unto which the Bodies of the Saints are to be at the Reſurrection.* This place affords variety of Matter for Obſervation. For, Firſt, If (according to *G. K.* here) that Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*, be *no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones*, but a pure,

Ethereal

Ethereal Body; then *J. Whitehead*, in denying the Aſſertion of his Opponent (*T. Grantham* the Baptiſt) did not deny the Body of Chriſt, nor that Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem:* For in that Aſſertion, which J. W. denied, *T. G.* affirmed, That Chriſt hath now a Body of *Fleſh and Bones* circumſcript, or limited in that Heaven which is above. But G. K. ſays, That Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*, is *no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones*; but a pure, *Ethereal*, or Heavenly Body: So that J. W. was not guilty of any Antichriſtian Doctrine, in denying that Aſſertion of T. G. but was very ſound and right therein, even according to G. K's own Doctrine: And therefore G. K. hath done very *fooliſhly*, as well as very *wickedly*, to Charge J. W. on this account, with Antichriſtian Doctrine; and with contradicting the plain Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, in a Fundamental Article of Faith. Secondly, It is obſervable, that G. K. ſays here, *That Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at* Jeruſalem, *and is now aſcended and glorified in Heaven, remains the ſame in ſubſtance, that it was on the Earth, although it be wonderfully changed, as to the mode and manner of its being*: And yet he ſays, *It is no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but a Pure, Ethereal, or Heavenly Body.* Now for my part, I confeſs, I was no wiſer (before this profound Philoſopher aroſe) than to think, that Fleſh, Blood and Bones had been of the ſubſtance of an outward, viſible, tangible Body, ſuch as was that which was Nailed to the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*. But this

this Acute Doctor hath now told us, that although that Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem* (which without all doubt conſiſted of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, when it was ſo Crucified) doth remain the ſame in ſubſtance, that it was on Earth: Yet it is *no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but is wonderfully changed, as to the mode and manner of its being.* So that the Change from being a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, to be no no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, is, it ſeems, with him, a Change but as to the *mode* and *manner* of its being; not as to its ſubſtance; but that, notwithſtanding its being *changed* from being a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, to be no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, it remains *the ſame in ſubſtance*, that it was on Earth; by which *G. K.* hath plainly denied that Fleſh, Blood and Bones were of the ſubſtance of that Body that was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*. When *G. K.* ſhall pleaſe to deſcend again into the *Ditch* of *Philoſophy*, (as to *fright* me, he called it) he may do well to inform Mankind, what the ſubſtance of that Body was, which was Crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*, if it was not Fleſh, Blood and Bones. Or, if upon ſecond thoughts, he ſhall confeſs, that the ſubſtance of it was Fleſh, Blood and Bones; then, how that Body remaineth the *ſame in ſubſtance*, as it was on Earth, and yet is *no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones*, but a pure, *Ethereal*, or heavenly Body: And by what Figure, a Change from being a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, to be no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, is called a Change, as to the *mode* or *manner* of its

being, but *not* as to its *substance*. Thirdly, His saying, It is no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, but a pure, *Ethereal*, or heavenly Body; and then adding, like unto which the Bodies of the Saints are to be at the Resurrection; plainly shews, that (according to him) the Bodies of the Saints at the Resurrection, shall be no more Bodies of Flesh, Blood and Bone, but pure, *Ethereal*, or heavenly Bodies. (But what an *Ethereal Body* is, he should have explain'd.) How long he will hold in this Mind, I cannot tell; it being so contrary to the common and carnal Notion of our other Adversaries, whose Cause he now Abets against us. Yet seeing he would not be understood now to be of *another Faith in any one Principle of Christian Doctrine, contrary to what he believed ever since he went under the Profession of a Quaker, so called; Nor to find any Cause to Correct either his Judgment or Books, as touching any of the great Doctrines or Principles of the Christian Religion*, (as he signifies, *True Copy*, p. 18.) Now if he esteems his Doctrine (of Christ's Body (that was Crucified) *being no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, but a pure, Ethereal or heavenly Body*, &c.) Either any Great Doctrine or Principle of the Christian Religion, or any Principle of Christian Doctrine; he is hereby obliged not to correct it, nor recede from it; or else if he does, he should have begun first at Home to correct himself therein; otherwise, if he sees no cause to Correct it, but stands by it, then how will he therein please or gratifie our Adversaries, whose Cause he has Abetted? Or what cause had he to

correct

correct Error in any of us, for Believing Christ's Body to be either *Spiritual* or *Heavenly*, &c. contrary to the gross and carnal Opinion of our said Adversaries?

But to return to his Charge against *J. W.* seeing he has not proved *J. W*'s words either Antichristian Doctrine, or contradictory to plain Scripture; let us see, in the next place, whether they are contradictory to *W. Penn*, which *G. K.* saith they are. The Contradiction he would make to be in that *J. W.* owneth no other Body of Christ (besides his Church) that is Circumscript, and out of every Man on Earth And *W. P.* saith, *The Body of Christ is not so much as in any one.* This he calls a plain Contradiction; but in plain truth it is no Contradiction at all. For J. W. speaks of the Body of Christ, as in *one* state, or capacity; *W. P.* speaks of it, as in *another*. J. W. speaks of it, as a Body consisting of *heavenly* Flesh and Bone, in which Christ was *glorified* with that Glory which he had with the Father before the World began. *W. P.* speaks of it, as that Body which he had *from the Virgin, strictly considered as such*. *W. P.* speaks of it, as in its state of *Humiliation* and Suffering. J. W. speaks of it, as in its state of *Exaltation* and Glory: And I do not think *G. K.* himself will adventure to say, that Christ's Body, or what he had from the Virgin, *strictly considered as such*, (which admits not of any Change, in manner or circumstance) is the same Body J. W. speaks of, consisting of heavenly Flesh and Bone, and glorified in Heaven. That plain Contradiction then, which *G. K.* pre-

tended to find, or make, between J. W. and W. P. is vaniſhed into a plain *Quibble*, and a meer *Cavil* of G. K's own.

But if he cannot make a Contradiction between J. W. and W. P. he'll try what he can do, to make an Appearance at leaſt of Contradiction between J. W. and G. W. To effect this, he oppoſeth to thoſe words of J. W. wherein he denied that Chriſt hath now a Body of Fleſh and Bones Circumſcript, or limitted in that Heaven which is above, a paſſage in the Poſtſcript to a Book, called, *The Malice of the Independent Agent rebuked*; which Poſtſcript he aſcribes to G. W. but why, or by what Authority, I know not: For I find not G. W's Name, or the Letters of his Name, to that Poſtſcript, or to any part of that Book. But whoſoever it be, I find in p. 24. (though he named it not) the words he Cites out of it, which he gives thus concerning the Fleſh of Chriſt, *It is ſo far circumſcribed, or encompaſſed in the Heavens, as 'tis capable of, and as is proper to it; and though it be Spiritual and Glorious, yet a Body, therefore not in every place where God is. To be Omnipreſent is only proper to God, and not to Bodies.* But he hath left out a material paſſage, which is, It is *not limitted or confined to any one place, or corner (as it were) of Heaven.* See now whether there be any Contradiction in theſe two ſayings. J. W. ſays, It is not Circumſcript, or *limitted* in that Heaven which is above. The other ſays, It is ſo far Circumſcribed, or encloſed in the Heavens, as 'tis capable of, and is proper to it; which how far that is, or whether at all or no,

is

is not there determined: But it is there determined, that it is not *limited* or confined to any one place of Heaven, which is Synonimous to *J. W*'s saying, It is not limited in Heaven. So that they are so far from contradicting each other, that they agree in *sense*, and as neat as could be reasonably expected, in *words* also. No cause therefore had *G. K.* to say, as here he does, *See how like* Sampson's *Foxes, though tyed by the Tail, their Paces look contrary*: But to shew his *scoffing* Spirit.

I thought I had gone through his List, because in the Introduction to it, he named *only Geo. Whitehead, Jo. Whitehead*, and *W. Penn*, and told his Reader, he design'd only to give him at present this short List of *these Mens* gross and vile Errors. But whether he was conscious to himself, that he had fallen short in his Undertaking against them, and hoped to gaul them from Another's Books, since he could not from their own; he now, toward the foot of his 21th page, falleth on the *Collection of* [illegible]en Crisp's *Treatises*, which he says, are rec[illegible]nded and signed by *Geo. Whitehead, Jo. Whitehead, Francis Camfeild, Jo. Vaughton, W. Bingley, John Field*, whom he calls *his chief Opposers and Adversaries*; and therein I believe he hath given *the truest Reason* of his Undertaking, which is, to *revenge* himself, if he can, upon them. Yet I observe he flies not quite so high here, as in his former Charges: For there he talkt at no less or lower rate, than *gross and vile Errors, Antichristian Doctrines, &c.* whereas now he is sunk to *gross and absurd Passages, unsound and unsavoury*

your Words; and yet calls them most offensive to Christian Ears.

The particular Treatise, he pitches upon, is called, *A Backslider reproved*, &c, (not, as he Emphatically reads it, *The Backslider*; that Title being perhaps reserved for himself, who may probably, in a peculiar manner, and beyond others, deserve it.) Which Book (being Printed in 1669. 26 Years ago) was in Answer to one *Rob. Cobbet*. The pages out of which *G. K.* picks his first Cavil are (in the *Collection*) 194, 197, and the matter he carps at he sets down confusedly, thus, *He* (*viz.* S. C.) *blameth the said* R. C. *for affirming that to be the Seed of Promise, which came by Generation, of and from the Properties of* Mary. *He further adds, Is not that the Seed of Promise mentioned in* Isaiah 9. 6. *who is called the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. And what is* Mary *the Mother of God? This will please the Papists well; and where is thy Scripture to prove that Jesus the Saviour was Created? And* p. 197. *he* (S. C. [illegible]), *But indeed we never believed him to be p[illegible]ced by Coagulation, as* R. C. *doth; nor by the Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary, *for then some might have declared his Generation, which the Scripture saith, who can do?* Thus far, in a sort of confused manner, *G. K.* hath Cited out of that Book of *S. C*'s; and upon this he bestows certain *Observations*, to the number, as he figures them, of six; but that the Fifth is rather his *Creed*, than his Observation. Now before I meddle with *G. K*'s Observations, I think it needful to give the Reader an account of

of ſome of the paſſages in *R. Cobbet*'s Book, which occaſioned the words above-cited from S. *Criſp* in Anſwer to them. *R. C.* had ſaid, in his Book called, *A Word to the Upright*, p. 18. That *the Soul of Chriſt was in Properties of and from Nature and Creature, made by Generation from the Properties of* Mary, *is that Seed God did promiſe to ſend to break the Serpent's Head.* (If it be Nonſenſe I cannot help it; for I take it as it is in *R. Cobbet*'s own Book.) But *the Soul of Man*, he ſaid, p. 4. *is a ſpark of God! Eternal Nature, coagulated into a ſpiritual ſubſtance, for a Center of his inſenſitive Life, and as thus compacted, is a Creature of an Eternal Being, of an own ſelf-ſubſiſting Conſiſtency, and having its abode in the Life of Time, is capable to be corrupted by Infection from the Life of Time*, &c. It was ſuch *ſtuff* as this, S. *Criſp* was to Anſwer to; and in his Anſwer, he ſaid, p. 193. *R. C. hath here deſcribed a Creature that ſubſiſts of it ſelf contrary to the Scripture, that ſaith, All things are upheld by the Word. And beſides, this Eternal Creature, as he calls it, this ſpark of God's Eternal Nature, this coagulated Subſtance, he ſays, was to be a Center for God's Inſenſitive Life. What,* Robert, *had it not a Center before?* And after many Expoſtulations with R. C. about thoſe ſtrange Notions of his, S. C. ſaid, p. 194. *But what Man's Soul, or the Soul of Jeſus either, is, thou knoweſt not; for if thou hadſt, thou wouldſt not have thus befool'd thy ſelf, to ſay,* Man's Soul *was a ſpark of God's Eternal Nature, and yet ſay, The Soul of Chriſt was but of the Properties of Nature made by Generation; nor yet have affirmed that*

to

to be the Seed of Promiſe, which came by Generation, of and from the Properties of Mary. I thought it not improper to make this Recital out of R. C's and S. C's Books, that the Reader might ſee what Notion R. C. had of the Seed of Promiſe, and whether S. C. did juſtly blame him or no, and thereby be the better able to judge, whether *G. K.* hath cauſe to complain of S. C. or no; or rather of R. C. But he rather ſpares, (and takes part with) our Adverſaries than us. Now let us hear his Complaints, which he ſets down by way of Obſervations.

The Firſt he makes is this, *It is denied here* (ſays he) *by* S. C *that that was the Seed of Promiſe, which came by Generation*, &c. *This*, ſays he, *is plain contrary to* Mat. 1. 1. *The Book of the Generation of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of* David, *the Son of* Abraham, p. 22. *Anſw.* Herein *G. K.* abuſeth *S. C.* for *S. C.* did not deny that to be the Seed of Promiſe, which came by Generation: But that which came by Generation *of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary. And ſince *G. K.* blames *S. C.* for this, and urges *Mat.* 1. 1. to prove the Generation of the Seed of Promiſe, he therein ſhews himſelf to be of a *corrupt* Judgment, and contradicts his former ſaying, p. 20. which was, That *neither the Body of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, nor the Soul of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, without the Godhead, —— is the Seed of the Woman, or Seed of* Abraham; *but the Godhead and Manhood jointly conſidered, and moſt glorioufly united*, Should I not ſerve him rightly, if from hence I ſhould conclude againſt him, that

that he holds the Seed of Promiſe, as conſiſting of Godhead and Manhood united, to have come by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*, ſince he blames *S. C.* for denying it? Doth not he himſelf ſay in his next Obſervation, *That Chriſt was the Son of God by an Eternal Generation before the World began?* And both he and all acknowledge, that Chriſt is the Promiſed Seed, that ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head: And muſt this *Eternal* Generation be dropt and loſt, and the Promiſed Seed be reſtrained to a Generation *by Coagulation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary? Doth not he himſelf ſay, (*Rect. Correct.* p. 27.) *Even the outward and viſible Fleſh which Chriſt took of the Virgin, was not produced or formed by Humane Generation?* And is he not aſhamed to blame *S. Criſp* for denying that which he himſelf hath denied?

His Second Obſervation is this, *As it is evident from Scripture, ſo it is the conſent of all ſound Chriſtians, That Chriſt was the Son of God by an Eternal Generation, before the World began: And the Son of* Abraham *and* David, *by Generation in the fulneſs of time; and though this Generation was miraculous, yet it was of and from* Mary, *&c. Anſw.* But was it of and from *Mary in the terms deviſed by S. C.?* Was the Generation of Chriſt in the fulneſs of time, by *Coagulation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary? (As *Cobbet* had affirmed, p. 6.) Did not the Angel tell *Mary*, (when ſhe asked, *How ſhall this be, ſeeing I know not a Man?*) *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon*

on thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be Born of thee, shall be called, The Son of God? Luke 1. 35. This was spoken, not of his *Eternal* Generation, but of his Generation in the fulness of time. The common *Creed*, called, The Apostles, says, *Christ was* **Conceived** *by the Holy Ghost*, though **Born** *of the Virgin* Mary. Now is it not a *gross and vile Error* to say, That *holy* thing, which was Conceived by the Holy Ghost, and by the overshadowing of the Power of the Highest, (and was therefore to be called the Son of God) was produced by *Coagulation*, or came by Generation, of and from *the Properties of Man* in *Mary*, especially considering that, as he was the Promised Seed, the Godhead was united with the Manhood, (as G. K. confesses) And is not G. K. then guilty of *gross and vile Error*, in blaming *S. C.* for condemning that Error in *R. Cobbet*, and in his joyning with *Cobbet* therein?

His Third Observation is, That S. C's *denying that Jesus the Saviour was Created, or calling for Scripture to prove it, doth sufficiently prove, that he understands Christ only to be God, and wholly excludes the Manhood of Christ, from being Christ, or any part of him. Answ.* Doth it so? Then let G. K. look to himself. For, by retortion, I return upon him, That his holding that Jesus the Saviour was Created (which he doth, by condemning S. C. for denying it) doth sufficiently prove, that he understands Christ to be *only Man*, and wholly *excludes* the Godhead of Christ,

Christ, from being Christ, or any part of him. Which to hold, is *a gross and vile Error*. Let him acquit himself as he can. I confess, I did not think him so deeply drencht into *Socinianism*: Besides, did not G. K. tell us in his last Observation, That Christ was the Son of God by an *Eternal Generation*, and the Son of *Abraham* by *Generation in* the fulness of *time*? So that in each respect, and under each denomination, he is by *Generation*; and would he have him be *created* also, only that he might render him *a meer* Socinian *Creature*? Herein (not S. *Crisp*, but) G. *Keith* is condemnable.

In his Fourth Observation, he says, *That Prophecy in* Isa. 9. 6. *unto us a Child is Born*, &c. *which is a plain Prophecy concerning Christ's Birth in the fulness of time, he* (S. C.) *plainly denieth it to be understood of Christ, as he was Born of* Mary. *Answ.* In this he says *falsly*, and greatly *abuses* S. C. For S. C. doth not deny that Prophecy to be understood of Christ as he was Born of *Mary*; but brings that Prophecy to shew, that Christ was not (as *Cobbet* had affirmed he was) produced by *Coagulation*, or *Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary. in as much as in that Prophecy he is called, *The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*. But will *G. K.* say, The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, was *produced by Coagulation*, or came by *Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary? But I observe *G. K.* in reciting that Prophecy, left out those *Divine* and Glorious

Titles given there to Christ, and recited only thus much, *Unto us a Child is Born*, covering the rest with an *&c.* which he knew would not suit well with his *Socinian Notion* of a Created Christ.

His Fifth, as I noted before, is rather his *Creed*, than his Observation; and therein he declares his *Belief*, *that he who was Born of* Mary, *is that Child or Son*, *given*, *who is both God and Man*, *and yet one Lord Jesus Christ*. Well, *S. Crisp* believed this as fully as *G. K.* can do, and so do all that are owned to be Quakers. He might have read in the same place of *S. C.*'s Book, out of which he pickt a part of his Cavil, p. 197. that *S. C.* said, *We never yet denied him that was Born of the Virgin* Mary, *and suffered under* Pontius Pilate, *to be the Lord and Saviour.* And then added those words which *G. K.* carps at, *viz. But indeed, we never did believe him to be produced by Coagulation, as* R. C. *doth, nor by Generation of and from the Properties of* Man *in* Mary. Now since *G. Keith* blames *S. Crisp*, for his blaming *R. Cobbet* for this; and since *G. K.* declares his own Belief, that he who was Born of *Mary* is that Christ or Son, given, who is both God and Man, and yet one Lord Jesus Christ, I put it home upon *G. K.* whether he doth believe, that he who was Born of *Mary*, and who is both *God and Man*, was *produced by Coagulation*, or made by *Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary? If he doth believe this, let him speak it out, fully and plainly, that all may see and know him; But if he doth not believe this,

this, let him not quarrel with *S. C.* for not believing that, which himself doth not believe.

His Sixth and last, and perhaps the idlest, of his Observations on this Cavil, is, That *he finds not only* S. C. *but* G. W. *quarrels with that Expression, calling* Mary *the Mother of God, as if,* (says he) *it were Popery. But,* says he, *are they wiser than the Holy Ghost, who giveth these Names to the Child that was to be Born, according to* Isaiah's *Prophecy, Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God? &c. Answ.* No; they never pretended to be wiser than the Holy Ghost; but by the Wisdom they had received from the Holy Ghost, they might well except against that Expression, calling *Mary the Mother of God*, which the Holy Ghost hath no where used throughout the Holy Scriptures, nor is it a *savoury* sound Expression. And if it be not strictly Popery (which neither *S.C.* nor G.W. said it was: The one saying only, *This will please the Papists well*; the other, *We do not read that* Mary *was the Mother of God, but in the Popes Canons*, &c.) yet it is probable it first arose from those gross, dark and *carnal* Apprehensions the Papists have, or had, concerning Christ; and has from them been suckt in, amongst other things, by such Protestants, as did not discern Truth from Error. But since G. K. *approves the Expression*, of calling *Mary* the *Mother of God*, and takes upon him to *defend* it, from the Titles given in *Isaiah*'s Prophecy, to the Child that was to be Born, I pinch him up here again, to declare, whether he believes Mary was the Mother of the Mighty

God, the Everlasting Father, which are some of the Titles there given unto that Child? Or whether that Child had those Titles given him, with respect to what he was to receive in and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*?

He hath another Cavil against *S. C.* which he takes out of the same Book, p. 192. where *S. C.* Citeth two Sentences out of *R. Cobbet*'s Book, one from p. 11. thus, *Ye are bought with a Price, not of Blood of Bulls, &c. but by the Blood of God*; the other, from p. 13. thus, *Which Blood being the Blood of his Humanity, as he was Creature, was that that did with God expiate for sin.* Upon this *S. C.* asks, *Which of these two Doctrines shall we believe, That we are saved by the Blood of God, or Blood of the Humanity? Or shall we suppose them to be both one; and so God to be Humane, and so the Doctrines indifferent?* Then adds, *R. C. will do well to clear up these things, or own his Condemnation upon his Folly and Presumption.* *G. K*'s Cavil at this is, *That* S. C. *did blame* R. C. *for calling the Blood of God the Blood of the Humanity, as he was Creature.* *Answ.* First, Let us observe *what sort of Humanity* R. C. spake of, or what he intended by the Humanity of Christ as he was Creature, namely, that which was *produced by Coagulation*, or came by Generation *of or from the Properties of Man in Mary*. Next let us observe how contrary this is to *G. K*'s own Doctrine, laid down in his *Rector Corrected*, p. 27. thus, *And indeed, even the outward and visible Flesh, which he* (Christ) *took of the Virgin, seeing it was not produced or formed by Humane Generation, but by a Divine*

Conception

Conception, through the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and did far excel the Flesh of all other Men that ever were since; insomuch also, that after Death, it was not subject to Corruption, the Name [humane] *is but too mean a Title, whereby to express it; far less should it be so called now, when it is glorified, and it is altogether heavenly and spiritual; nor doth the Scripture any where give unto his Body such a Name, as Humane. The First Man is of the Earth, earthy; the Second* Adam, *the Lord from Heaven, heavenly,* 1 Cor. 15. Thus *G. K.* then. And in p. 29. he quotes *Hilarius*, (of great esteem (he says) among the Fathers) saying, *Lib.* 10. *de Trinitate*, concerning the *Body* of Christ, that was *Born of the Virgin*, *Jesus Christ was not formed by the Nature of Humane Conception*, and that *the Original of his Body, is not of an Humane Conception. And why*, saith he, *is the Flesh conceived of the Holy Ghost, judged by the Nature of an Humane Body? So that* saith *G. K. we see, he findeth fault with the Word Humane, as well as* G. F. And why then, say I, might not *S. Crisp* find fault with the word *Humane*, as well as *Hilarius*, *G. F.* and *G. K.* (who we see, not long ago, found fault with it also) especially when used in *such* an acceptation, and to set forth *such* a sort of Humanity, as *R. C.* used it in? For by that *Humanity* which *S. C.* found fault with, *R. C.* meant something *produced by Coagulation*, or Generation of and from *the Properties of Man in* Mary. Whereas not only *Hilarius* of old said, (as *G. K.* Cites him) *Jesus Christ was not formed by the Nature of Humane Conception*, and that *the Original of*

his Body is not of an Humane Conception. But G. K. of *late* hath said, That *even the outward and visible Flesh which he took of the Virgin was not produced or formed by Humane Generation, but by a Divine Conception through the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; and that the Name, Humane, is but too mean a Title, whereby to express it.* So that I conclude G. K. both by this Testimony of his own, and those which he hath adduced of *Hilarius*, hath sufficiently justified S. *Crisp* in finding fault with the word *Humanity*, and *Blood of the Humanity*, with respect to Christ, especially in *such a Notion* of Humanity, as R. C. used it in. But as he has justified S. C. so he has condemned himself; and both *Hilarius* and G. K. are against G. K. How well G. K. will be able to defend himself, against *Hilarius* and himself, I know not. He, (and *Hilarius* also) but even now, spake highly against the word *Humane*, as relating to Christ, positively affirming the outward and visible Flesh, which Christ took of the Virgin was not produced, or formed, by *Humane* Generation. Now he falls in with R. *Cobbet*, and even upon such a Notion of the Humanity of Christ, as R. C. had formed in his own Brain, owns the term *Humanity*, as respecting Christ and the Blood of his Humanity, and *approving* R. Cobbet's *Assertion*, that the Blood of that Humanity did expiate with God for sin, says, *This is a sound Assertion*, and to contradict it is Folly and Presumption, p. 23. So that, according to R. C. and G. K. The Blood of that that was produced, or came by Generation *of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary,

Mary, *was the Blood of* God, and did expiate with God for Sin. But this (according to G. K.) could not be the Blood of Christ: For G. K. saith expresly (as before-cited) that even the outward and visible Flesh which Christ took of the Virgin, was not produced or formed by *Humane Generation*, and brought *Hilarius* to vouch it. But though *S. Crisp* did justly reject R. C's unscriptural Notion of an Humanity of Christ, and the Blood of *such* an Humanity to be the *Blood* of God, and to expiate for sin: And whereby his Church is purchased, *Acts* 20. 28. Yet neither did he, nor doth any one owned to be of the People called Quakers, deny the *holy Manhood* of Christ, or the Blood of *that Manhood*, which he offered as a part of the one Offering to his Father, or the Vertue and Efficacy thereof with God to expiate for sin: Yet, *Quest.* If *God's own Blood* whereby his Church is purchas'd, *Acts* 20. 28. intends only the Blood of Christ outwardly shed, or the intire Christ the Son of God, as *he* was given a Ransom, *&c.*

I have now done with his Cavils at *S. Crisp*, that Eminent Labourer in the Lord's Vineyard, who (like the other *Stephen* of old, *Acts* 6. 5.) was *full of Faith, and of the Holy Ghost*; and who, to his *extraordinary* Endowments of Nature, had an *extraordinary* Addition of Divine Wisdom, and heavenly Experiences in the Work and Way of the Lord, in which he was an early Traveller, and a diligent, faithful Labourer to the last; for which *his Memory is blessed*, and his Name Honourable, not only in

the

the Church of Christ, but amongst many that are without; which renders this *Detractor*'s work the more *vile* and *base*.

But I have not yet done with G. K. who to his List of pretended gross and vile Errors, having added another, which he calls, *An Additional List to the former* (to the most material parts of which I have spoken already) raises another Cavil, p. 26. against both G. W. and W. P. about the words *History* and *Mystery* of Christ. (For he is a *Word-peeker*, a great Logomachist, like them the Apostle warned *Timothy* of, 2 *Tim.* 6. 4, 5.) The words he quarrels with G. W. about, are these; *We really own, and confess to the Blood of Christ, both in the History and in the Mystery.* (Christian Quaker, 2d part, p. 243.) *By this*, says G. K. *it plainly appears, that he did not own the Blood of Christ, as it was outwardly shed, to have any Mystery in it; that Blood outwardly shed, was Blood in the History, but the Life, or Spirit, or Light within, that's Blood in the Mystery.* And p. 27. speaking of them both, he says, *It's plainly evident, that they make not only Christ's Works and Sufferings without us, but History; but even Christ himself without us, is to them but* History. Thus G. K. But what more perverse and false Construction could the most perverse of Men have put upon G. W's words, than this which G. K. hath put, *viz.* That G. W. did not own the Blood of Christ, as it was outwardly shed, to have *any* Mystery in it, and that he makes Christ's Works and Sufferings without, and Christ himself without, to be *but* History? For most evident it is, that by those words,

words, (we really own and confeſs to the Blood of Chriſt, both in the Hiſtory and in the Myſtery) G. W. intended no more nor other, but that we really own and confeſs to the Blood of Chriſt, not only in a Myſtical Senſe, but alſo *according to that hiſtorical account of it*, which we read in the Writings of the Evangeliſts. For it is to be noted, that thoſe words of G. W's are part of an Anſwer to a Queſtion. Our Adverſaries, of one Perſwaſion and another, had entertained a *groundleſs Jealouſie* againſt us, that we owned Chriſt, his Fleſh, Blood, Sufferings, Death, *&c. only* in a Myſtical Senſe: But did not own them really and outwardly, as in the Letter of the Scripture is ſet forth. To remove this Jealouſie, the Queſtion was ſtated and put, (*Chriſtian Quaker*, part. 2. p. 243.) as in the Name and Perſon of ſuch Oppoſers, thus; *What did the Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed beſpeak? And what is our Senſe of Chriſt's Blood, and for what end owned?* To this G. W. anſwered thus. Firſt, *It* (*viz.* The Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed) *did beſpeak Remiſſion of ſin paſt, to all that truely repent and believe in him.* Secondly, *Our ſenſe of the Blood of Chriſt is a living and ſpiritual ſenſe of the virtue and efficacy of it*, (*viz.* the Blood of Chriſt that was ſhed) *as through it we receive Redemption, even the Forgiveneſs of ſins.* Thirdly, *We really own and confeſs to the Blood of Chriſt, both in the Hiſtory* (that is, according to the Scriptural or Written Account given of it by the Holy Evangeliſts) *and in the Myſtery* (that is, according to our living and ſpiritual ſenſe of the Virtue and Efficacy of it,

it, as, through it, we have received Redemption, even the Forgiveneſs of ſins) Now what but Malice it ſelf, and that boyl'd up to the *higheſt degree*, could have inferr'd from hence, that becauſe *G. W.* owned the Blood of Chriſt both in the Hiſtory and in the Myſtery, therefore he did not own the Blood of Chriſt, as it was outwardly ſhed, to have *any* Myſtery in it. The Queſtion there was not, whether the Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed, had a Myſtery in it, or no, (for whoever doubted that?) But what that Blood did beſpeak, and whether we owned it, or no. To this *G. W*'s Anſwer was plain and full. It did beſpeak Remiſſion of ſin paſt to all that truly Repent and Believe in him. And we really own and confeſs to the Blood of Chriſt, both in the Hiſtory, *i. e.* according to the Account given of it, in the Scriptures; and in the Myſtery, *i. e.* according to that living and ſpiritual ſenſe we have of the Virtue and Efficacy of it, having received Redemption, even the forgivneſs of Sins through it: and he added, *And the value of the one Offering, we do in the Sight of God confeſs, and own the Blood of Chriſt, both as Shed for us, and as Sprinkling and Purging our Conſciences from dead works.*

The Words he Cavils at *W. P.* for, (taken out of his Rejoynder to *John Faldo*, p. 336. 337.) *The Hiſtory is made the greateſt Myſtery, & to Believe the one, matter of greater Difficulty, then to Experience the other:* and, *'Tis ſtrange that ſhould be Reputed moſt Myſterious, which was the Introduction to the Myſtery*, &c. This is ſo far from Rendring

dering Christ in his Outward Appearance or Manifestation, his Conception, Birth, Life, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, &c. *but* History, or History *only* (as *G. K.* suggests) that it plainly acknowledges it to be a *Mystery*, and only blames the Opponent for Debasing and Lessening the *great Mystery* of Christ's being Formed and Brought Forth in the heart by Faith, and therein working those Great and Wonderful Works, which are wrought in the Truely Regenerate Ones: which was the Mystery, *W. P.* then defended against his Opponent *J. F.* from those Words of the Apostle, Col. 1. 27. *To whom God would make known what is the Riches of the Glory of this Mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you the hope of glory*; which the Mystery of his Conception, Birth, &c. Outwardly, did make way for, and lead unto: and *J. F*'s opposing the Outward Mystery to the Inward, and preferring that to this, gave the occasion to *W. P.* to say, *The History is made the greatest Mystery, and to Believe the One* (which too many do, with a meer Historical Faith) *is made matter of greater difficulty, than to experience the other*, (which cannot be done but by & through a Living, Divine, Saving Faith.) This *W. P.* blamed in his Opponents, saying, *'Tis strange that should be reputed most mysterious, which was the Introduction to the* Mystery, (as the Outward was to the Inward) *and those Transactions* (outward Works, Miracles, Cures, &c. wrought by Christ in the Outward Body of Flesh) *counted most difficult, that were by the Divine Wisdom of God, ordained as so many facile Representations of what*

was

was to be accomplished in Man. In short, said he, *it is to lessen, if not totally to exclude, the true Mystery of Godliness, which is Christ manifest in his Children, their Hope of Glory.* And although G. K. doth now fall in with our old Opposer J. *Faldo*, and spends the Remainder of his Pamphlet in railing at *W. P.* for this; yet therein he doth but contradict himself in what he writ formerly, when he was of a *sounder mind*, concering this Great and Heavenly Mystery, *Christ within*; for in his Book called, *The Way cast up*, Printed in the Year 1677. he says p. 109. *It was a great part of the Mystery that* Paul *Preached unto the Gentiles, to wit, Christ in the Gentiles, which* (says he) *Satan and his Ministers, laboured to hide and obscure, as they do at this present, but Christ and his Ministers labour to make known* (as *W. P.* did against one of those Ministers, who then laboured to hide and obscure it; for which G. K. being himself now become one of Satans Ministers, blames *W. P.* and falls in with that other against him) in the same place he quotes, *Col.* 1. 27. (the very Text in Controversy between W. P. and *J. Faldo*) and 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. applying the Mystery mentioned in those Texts, to the *inwards* Appearance and Formation of Christ in the Heart. and in p. 111. from *Gal.* 4. 19. he saith, *Christ is formed in the Saints, so that they are his Mother who bring him forth*, by a Spiritual and Divine Birth (for which he Cites *Mat.* 12. 49.) and adds, *That the Church brought him forth long after he was outwardly Born and Crucified, and Rose and Ascended*, (for which he quotes *Rev.* 12. 5.) Is not this a most Sublime Mystery, that

the

the Church should be Mother to Him who by the Prophet is called The Everlasting Father, Isa. 9. 6. And in p. 134. having spoken (in the fore-going Page) of the comfortableness of this Doctrine, That we have the Man Jesus Christ so near unto us in Virtue of his Divine Life and Soul, as his Divine Seed and Body extended into us, and that thus he is the Incarnate Word, or Word made Flesh, dwelling in our Flesh, he saith, It is the Word made Flesh, or God manifest in Flesh, to wit, to the Heavenly Flesh, or Manhood of Christ, that is the alone proper and adequate Object of the Contemplation and Enjoyment of the most glorious Angels, as well as of the most holy Souls, as (says he) Paul declared, Great is the Mystery of Godliness, God manifested in the Flesh, &c. seen of Angels. Observe here (says he) it is not God simply, but God manifest in Flesh, that is seen of Angels, and is believed on in the World. And to manifest that by the Heavenly Flesh, or Manhood of Christ, he doth not mean that Outward Body which Christ took of the Virgin, he adds, that He was both seen of Angels, and believed on in the World, long before he was manifest in that outward Body of Flesh, which was also a most glorious Manifestation, and excelleth in glory all the Outward Manifestations that ever were or shall be; but the Angels and Saints, he says, did really see him, before that manifestation in Outward Flesh; and the Saints do now really see him, although his outward Body and external Person be not now present for us to behold. And he gives this reason of their seeing him, because he is in them: For, says he, The Word Incarnate, or made Flesh, and called by James the ingrafted Word, we do really see, for

is dwelleth in us; and unless it were made Flesh, or Incarnate, it could not be ingrafted into us. And again, to prevent any ones mis-thinking, that by Flesh he means the *outward Flesh* which was taken of the Virgin, he adds, p. 135. *The Word was first of all made Flesh, to be the Root and Foundation of all other created Beings, and for which they are created.* From all which it appears, that G. K. then expounded that Great Mystery of Godliness which the Apostle spake of, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. to be meant of the manifestation of God in the heavenly Flesh, or Manhood of Christ, which was from the beginning, long before he took outward Flesh upon him in which he suffered; and the manifestation and indwelling of that heavenly Flesh, or Manhood of Christ, in the hearts of his People. In vain therefore doth he cavil at W. P. for maintaining that, which he himself hath so plainly asserted.

And very idle is he, in saying, p. 27. *Seeing the Work of Regeneration and Sanctification in the Saints, is a great Mystery, must we not own him who is the Author, and great Cause of it, to be greater?* For whoever question'd that? We all own the *Workman* to be *Greater* than the *Work*; the Author and great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, to be greater than the Regeneration and Sanctification wrought. And this Author and great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, we say is Christ; and that *chiefly* as he is manifested inwardly in the heart: for he works it not in any, but those in whom he is so inwardly manifested. Idle therefore is *G. K.* in saying, *Unless* W. P. *will say, That it is not Christ*

without

without us, but only Christ within us, to be the Author and Cause of Regeneration: For *W. P.* doth *not divide Christ without* from *Christ within*, (as our Adversaries would do) but doth acknowledge Christ without to be the Author and Cause of Regeneration, but *not barely as he is Christ without*, and while he is *only without*; but as he, who is Christ without, is inwardly received by true Faith into the heart, and so comes to be Christ within, as well as Christ without.

Idle and silly he is, in saying of *W. P. Indeed if he can prove that as only Christ within Men, is the Cause of Regeneration, he hath gained his point; but this he will never be able to do.* For by retortion, I put upon him, If he can prove, That *only* Christ, as *without* Men, is the Cause of Regeneration, he hath gained his point; but this he will never be able to do. For as it is certain that Christ *within*, where he is received into the heart by true Faith, *doth* cause and work Regeneration and Sanctification there; so it is also certain, that Christ *without* doth *not* work Regeneration or Sanctification in any heart, into which he is not received by Faith.

Idle and false he is, in saying, p. 38. *W. P. maketh Christ without* but *the Introduction to the Mystery, Christ within*: For the word (*but*) is not *W. P.*'s, but *G. K.*'s.

Idle and false again, in saying, *W. P. sets things in opposition, which ought not to be opposed, but joyned together*: for it was not *W. P.* but his Opponent *J. E.* that set the Mystery of Christs outward Appearance and Manifestation in his Outward Body of Flesh, in Opposition to the Inward

Mystery of his being formed and brought forth Inwardly, in the hearts of Believers.

Idle and grosly false again, and *self-confuting* also, in saying, *W. P. perverts most grosly those words of the Apostle*, Paul, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *Without controversie great is the Mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit*, &c. *Jumbling two places of Scripture together, and confounding their sence*, (viz. 1 Tim. 3. 16. and Col. 1. 27.) Whereas, 1st, *W. P.* is so far from jumbling those two places together, or perverting that first place, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. that (so far as I observe) he doth not at all mention that place, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. or the words of it, in any of those pages *G. K.* hath cited out of his Rejoynder to *J. Faldo*. But 2dly, G. K. himself, in his *Way cast up*, p. 109. hath (if I may use his own word) *jumbled* those two places of Scripture together, and confounded their sense (that is, as I understand him, rendred them both of one sense) where he says, *It was a great part of the Mystery that Paul preached unto the Gentiles, to wit Christ in the Gentiles*: And says, See *Colos.* 1. 27. *To whom God would make known what is the Riches of the glory of this Mystery* in *the* Gentiles, *and* Eph. 1. 8. *he preached the unsearchable Riches of Christ* in *the* Gentiles. *And* 1 Tim. 3. 16. *God manifest in the Flesh, preached* in *the* Gentiles; *so the* Greek (says he) *in all these places, but the Translators of the Bible, not understanding this so blessed and comfortable a Truth, have Translated these places* (among) *and not* (in) *whereas if Christ was among them, he was also in them, seeing he was not outwardly present among them, in his Body of Flesh.*

Thus

Thus G. K. By which it is plain, that he did then Expound both those Texts (Col. 1. 27. and 1 Tim. 3. 16.) to one and the same sense and signification; and that he did apply the words of the Apostle, in 1 Tim. 3. 16. to the *inward Mystery* of Christ's inward Appearance, and Manifestation within, in the Hearts of Believers, explaining the words (*God manifest in the Flesh, as preached* unto *the* Gentiles.) And if so to Expound, or Apply them, be to pervert them, and that (as he says) most grossly; G. K. himself is the *grosser Perverter* of them, having, as I have shewed, so expounded and applied them. He should therefore have first *corrected himself*, which not having done, it is a most gross piece of Impudence in him to fly thus fiercely, and fall thus fowlly on W. P. for that which himself is guilty of, and W. P. is not.

Many more Passages might be brought out of that Book of G. K's, called, *The Way cast up*, printed in the Year 1677. to shew how much G. K. did formerly admire, and contend for, this *great Mystery, Christ formed in the Saints*, which now he seems to make *so light of*, in comparison of the Mystery of Christ's Incarnation, or *only* taking Flesh in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, as he expresst it, p. 104. In p. 157. he calls it a Wonderful Mystery; *This wonderful Mystery*, says he, *Christ himself doth clearly hold forth*; John 17. 23. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. *Observe here*, says he, *an excellent Order*, Christ *in the Saints, and God in Christ*; *so that as in respect of Union, God is not immediately in us, nor immediately*

diately united with us, nor we with him: But God is in Christ, and Christ is in us, and so God through Christ is in us. And thus, says he, Christ doth declare himself to be the Mediator between God and Man, as his is in them: Thou in me, and I in them. Here Christ is the Middle-man or Mediator, as being in the Saints, which confutes the grosse and most comfortless Doctrine of the Presbyterians and others, who affirm that Christ as Mediator is only without us, in Heaven, and is not Mediator in us; whereas he himself in this place hath declared the contrary, Thou in me, and I in them, that they may be made perfect in one. And a little lower, in p. 158. he adds, If Christ be Mediator in the Saints, then he is Man, or the word Incarnate in them, &c.

The rest of his Pamphlet is mostly made up of *Railing*, chiefly against *W. P.* and that in a Stile so *scornful*, *scurrilous* and *rude*, as rather deserves *Contempt* than *Answer*. And therefore I intend at this time to return him no other, than what he gave his Opponent, in his *Way cast up*, p. 168. 169. viz. *It were a needless labour to follow him, in all the rest of his Discourse, or to give a particular Reply to every Sentence, the whole containing no Arguments, to prove us guilty of such things. He had done more as a Man, and as a Christian, to have charged us with some things that we did truly hold, and if he did suppose them to be Errors, to have endeavoured to refute them with solid Arguments, brought from Scripture and sound Reason; nothing of which he hath done, but raileth on from the beginning to the end. It seemeth verily, that he is better skilled in the Art of Railing, than*

than in the way of *Diſputing*. But, ſays he, *I ſhall take notice of one thing before I leave him.* And ſo, ſay I, ſhall I take notice of *one* or *two* things, before I leave him.

One is, that he ſays, p. 31. *He hath divers other groſs and vile Errors wherewith to Charge* G. W. *and* W. P. *but that he ſhall keep theſe others to a further reſerve.* To which I ſay, If he hath not others, but ſpake this only for a *vapouring Threat*, he has told a poſitive Untruth. If he hath others, that he thinks to be groſs and vile Errors, (though they ſhall prove as far from being ſo, as theſe are which he hath brought already) yet in concealing them, and keeping them to a further Reſerve, he acts not *charitably*, nor *honeſtly*, nor *like a Chriſtian*, with reſpect either to the Perſons charged, or to others. For if he believes the things he hath to Charge on them, are groſs and vile Errors, he ought *with all ſpeed* firſt to have acquainted them with them, that they might repent of them, and explain or amend them, if they be ſuch; which if they refuſed to do after due Conviction, then to have informed others of them, that they, being forewarned, might not be miſled by them. This, Chriſtian Charity (had it been in him) would have led him to; and common Honeſty (had he had it) would have taught him, not to put Men under the imputation of *groſs and vile Errors*, by a *general* Charge, and keep the Proofs back. But as the Reader may reaſonably gueſs, by what has been already brought forth, what ſort of Mouſe he may expect, upon the next Delivery of this

Caledonian

Caledonian Mountain: So he may plainly ſee, by theſe Political Reſerves, that *not Conſcience*, nor any thing of kin to a godly Concern; but *Envy*, *Revenge*, and *crafty Contrivance*, to do (as he thinks) the *greateſt miſchief* to the Perſons and Profeſſion he is turned againſt, have been the prevailing Motives on him, to this his evil Undertaking; though it be alſo to cloud and invalidate his own former Spiritual Teſtimonies.

The other thing I take notice of is; *the Demand he makes to* W. P. *of a Publick Meeting*, in order to his being proved *an Apoſtate*, which he ſays *W. P.* called him in the *Meeting at* Ratcliff. And to countenance his Demand, he urges the Example of the Baptiſts, who (he ſays) having heard his Complaint againſt *Thomas Hicks*, will riſe *in Judgment againſt* W. P. if he will not hear this Complaint of his againſt him. How far W. P. might have condeſcended to have anſwered his Demand, in caſe he had found him in a compoſed Mind, and that *Sincerity* and *Ingenuity* had had any place in him, I know not: But I am perſuaded if he had, he would not have been drawn to it by the reaſon t'other urges, of the Baptiſt's Example in the Caſe of *T. Hicks*, between which and this there is no parallel. For in that, there was a *People* concerned on each ſide: For *T. Hicks* had aſſaulted and ſlandered the *whole People* called Quakers, and was himſelf both of a People, and backed by a People. Whereas W. P's calling *G. K. Apoſtate*, affects no Body, that I know of, but himſelf, and himſelf but juſtly; neither is *G. K.*

of

of any People now, ſo far as I can underſtand, though he hovers over a ſort of ſcattered Company, for a while, till he can find where to ſettle more to his Advantage. Nor do I think W. P. would have thought the moſt publick Meeting publick enough, to have proved him an Apoſtate in, (*had that work been now to do*) but rather have choſen to have done it by the *Preſs*; compared to which, the moſt publick Meeting is but private. I ſay, had that work been now to do, becauſe I reckon *G. K.* hath ſaved W. P. that labour (*which yet would not have been great*) and in the two Pamphlets he hath ſince publiſhed, (to which this is intended for an Anſwer) hath ſo plainly, fully and effectually proved himſelf *an Apoſtate*, from the People called Quakers, from his own former Teſtimonies for them, and their Chriſtian Doctrine; that it would be but a ſort of *Tautology*, and a queſtioning the ſufficiency of *G. K*'s performance, (*which in that part has been moſt ſucceſsful*) for W. P. to add any thing to it. And indeed, it was but fit *G. K.* ſhould do this *neceſſary Office* for himſelf; for as he has worded his Demand, he ſeems to have beſpoke a publick Meeting, that he might have done it himſelf there. Hear it in his own words thus. *And now I propoſe this juſt Demand to* W. Penn, *that whereas at* Ratcliff Meeting, *ſome few weeks ago, he called me an Apoſtate, and judged me ſo to be in the Name of the Lord, That he give me an Opportunity*, (either at *Ratcliff Meeting*, where he paſſed this Sentence in a publick Meeting againſt me, or *Grace-Church-Street Meeting*, or any other

ther *Publick Meeting* of the People called Quakers, in or about *London*) *to make good his Charge against me, &c.* See here the Sum of *G. K*'s Demand of W. P. *viz. That he give me* (says *G. K.*) *an Opportunity, to make good his Charge against me,* as if he wanted such an Opportunity to prove himself an Apostate; (for as for all that is interposed in the Sentence, relating to the Choice of Place, either at *Ratcliff*, or *Grace-Church-Street*, or any other publick Meeting, *&c.* it is but, in Grammatical Construction, a Parenthesis, (as 'tis now marked above) and without injury to the sense, may be taken away, or transposed.) That ever such a *Rabbi* of the *Rabbi*'s, such an *Arch-Grammarian*, should thus *befool himself*, and not see it! Whence may one suppose this to come, but from a strange Infatuation, and judicial Blindness, suffered by Providence to come upon him, for his little less than Idolizing his Learning and Parts? But as in this Demand he has discovered his Folly: So in the Book wherein he makes this Demand, and in the other he printed presently after it, he himself hath so throughly proved the Charge, of his being an Apostate, that there was no need for him to demand a further Opportunity for the doing it, as there is no Cause for W. P. to give it.

The 12th of the 5th Month, 1695.

T. E.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

THat it may further appear, how injurious G. K. hath been to G. W. and W. P. in charging them with denying, or diſ-eſteeming the Man Chriſt, and the Virtue or Efficacy of his Blood, I have thought fit here to add ſome Paſſages, which (in reading) I obſerved in ſome of their Books, and in thoſe chiefly, out of which he hath framed his Cavils againſt them.

In the Book, called, *The Light and Life of Chriſt within*, &c. *G. W.* ſays, p. 39. 'We ne-'ver denied the Man Chriſt, nor that he took up-'on him Fleſh, or was Born of the Virgin ac-'cording to the Fleſh, nor did we ever deny 'Chriſt to be the Saviour. But as for thoſe Ex-'preſſions, God-Man, being Born of *Mary*, we 'do not find them in the Scriptures, nor do we 'read that *Mary* was the Mother of God, but 'in the Pope's Canons, Articles, *&c.*

In the ſame Book, p. 52. he asks his Oppo-nent, 'Is it good Doctrine to ſay, that that 'Blood, (or Life) which ſanctifies and juſti-'fies true Believers in all Ages, is not in Being? 'When Sanctification, purging the Conſcience, '*&c.* is a real Work, can it be done by a thing 'that is not? Then adds, 'And yet we know 'that *Chriſt the One Offering*, the *Living Sacrifice*,

'and the *Blood of the Covenant*, which cleanseth 'them that walk in the Light, 1 *John* 1. 7. *is* 'still in being, and was throughout Ages, and he 'is said to be a Lamb slain from the Foundation 'of the World, and made his Grave with the 'Wicked, &c. And that his Sufferings do all 'testifie for God, his Love and Good-will; 'though *being reconciled through his Death, we are* 'saved by his Life, Rom. 5. 10.

Again, in the same Book, p. 59. 'Christ, 'the One Offering, was the Man peculiarly or-'dained, or appointed of God, both to bear 'the Sins of many, to end the many Offerings 'under the Law; and in all his Example and 'Sufferings, that were permitted to be laid on 'him, he both answered, fulfilled and ended 'the outward Part and Administration of the 'Law and Shadows, and performed the Father's 'Will therein; and was particularly Eyed and 'Propheſied of accordingly by the Holy Pro-'phets; and through all his Sufferings in the 'Flesh, he gave an Universal Testimony, and 'Consecrated a New and Living Way, even 'through the Vail, that is *to say*, his Flesh, that 'the Way into the most Holy might be mani-'fest.

And in the Book called, *Christ ascended a-bove the Clouds*, p. 18, 19. *G. W.* saith, "And "further, to take off Objections and Scruples, "I confess, that, according to the Flesh, Jesus "Christ came of the Seed of *David*; and the "Body that he took upon him, or that was pre-"pared for him to do the Will of God in up-"on Earth, was a real (and not a fantastical) "Body:

" Body: And that, according to the Fleſh, he " was put to Death, or died for our Sins, (ac- " cording to the Scriptures) and was buried, " and roſe again the the third day, and was af- " ter ſeen of the Diſciples, and of above five " hundred Brethren at once. *&c.*

And in the Book called, *The Divinity of Chriſt*, &c. p. 45. G. W. ſaith, " His (Chriſt's) Suffering " *as a Man*, or *in the Fleſh*, without the Gates " at *Jeruſalem*, was all acceptable to God; his " Soul was alſo made an Offering for Sin, and " he was a Lamb ſlain from the Foun- " dation of the World: But the Myſtery, " Vertue, and Effects of his Sufferings none " knows, but they that believe in his Name, and " receive the Righteouſneſs of Faith.

In the ſame Book, p. 49. he ſaith, " The " Power of Chriſt, and his bleſſed Effects in " his Death, acceptable Sacrifice, *&c.* we own, " more than they (meaning his Opponents, *Tho.* " *Vincent*, and other Presbyterian Prieſts) for " he gave himſelf to redeem Man from Sin and " Tranſgreſſion, and the ſervitude of it; and " *his Blood purgeth the Conſcience*, Cleanſeth from " all Sin, his Fleſh is given for the Life of " the World, that man may come to riſe out " of Sin, and live again to God in Perfect Righ- " teouſneſs: God hath ſet him forth to be " a Propitiation *through Faith in his Blood*, to " declare his Righteouſneſs for the Remiſſion " of Sins paſt, through the Forbearance of God, " *Rom.* 3. 25.

And in the Second Part of the ſame Book, (in a page unfigured, but it is the next but

one to p. 72.) he says, "Neither would we "have any Unreverent and Slighty Contests "entertained, on any hand; about the Sufferings, Afflictions and Death of Christ, in the "least, to lessen or undervalue them.

And in the Book called, *The Christian Quaker*, 2d. part, p. 97. G. W. saith, "To prevent "these Mens Scruples concerning our owning "*the man Christ*, or the *Son of man in Glory*, I "tell them seriously, that I do Confess, both to "his Miraculous Conception by the Power of "the Holy Spirit, Overshadowing the Virgin "*Mary*, and to his being Born of her according "to the Flesh, and so that he took upon him "a Real Body (and not a Fantastical) and that "he was *Real Man*, come of the Seed of *Abra-*"*ham*; and that he, in the days of his Flesh, "preached Righteousness, wrought Miracles, "was crucified and put to death by wicked "hands; that he was buried, and rose again the "third day, according to the Scriptures; and "after he arose, he appeared diversly, or in di-"vers forms and manners, he really appeared "to many Brethren, 1 *Cor.* 15. and afterwards "*ascended into Glory*; being Translated accor-"ding to the Wisdom and Power of the hea-"venly Father, and is glorified with the same "Glory which he had with the Father, before "the World began, *&c.*

And in the same part of the same Book, p. 105, he saith, "It is none of our Assertion, That "Christ, in his Death and Sufferings, was *but* "*only* a Pattern or Example of that which must "be wrought over again in us, (which was the

one

"Adver-

" Adversaries Objection against us) for though " we own him to have left an Example; yet he " was *more than* an Example; and he did not " only end the Types, but *was a Sacrifice and* " *Offering for Mankind*, and opened the New " and Living Way, giving Testimony of Gods " free Love towards all, and making way for the " enforcing of the New Testament, or Cove- " nant of Life.

Again, *Ibid.* p. 149. " We never denied the " Man Christ Jesus, nor him to be Christ, that " was born of the Virgin, according to the " Flesh.

Again, *Ibid*, p. 150. ' *Far be it from us to deny* ' *Christ being truly Man*, because we confess his ' Divinity, or to deny him in any of his Appear- ' ances either in the Flesh or Spirit: For he was ' truly Christ, the Son of God, when miracu- ' lously conceived and born of the Virgin *Mary*; ' and his Name was also called *Immanuel*, God ' with us: Now, dare you say, That all these emi- ' nent Names, and Divine Appellations given ' to him, when in the flesh, did most properly and ' originally belong to the Flesh or Body, and ' not rather to something more Eminent and Di- ' vine therein?

Again, *Ibid.* p. 223. ' Though the phrase, ' [*Merit of Christs Blood and Sufferings*] be not a ' Scripture-phrase, yet *the Worth and Values there-* ' *of*, with respect to Mans Salvation, we never ' disesteemed, since we knew the true and spi- ' ritual Application, Vertue, and Effects of *his* ' *Blood*, &c. through his Light and Spirit, to ' the purging our Consciences, Cleansing and ' Justifying, &c.

Thus

Thus far out of G. W.'s Writings; and much more might be brought to the same effect.

And in that Book called, *The Christian Quaker, and his Divine Testimony Vindicated*, out of which *G. K.* hath taken much of his Charge against *W. Penn*, many Testimonies are born to that outward Appearance of Christ in the Flesh, of which these that follow are some.

'But notwithstanding the same Light and 'Life, with that which afterwards cloathed it 'self with that Outward Body, did in measure 'inwardly appear for the Salvation of the Souls 'of Men; yet, as I have often said, *Never did 'that Life so eminently put forth it self for that 'end, as in that Sanctified and Prepared Body*; so 'that *what he then Suffered and Did in that Tran-'scendent Manifestation, may by way of Eminency 'assume the whole Work unto it self*, that he ever 'did before, or might do afterwards. For 'doubtless, that very Light, Life and Power, 'which dwelt in that Fleshly Tabernacle emi-'nently was the Convincer, Condemner, Sa-'viour and Redeemer; yet not only as confined 'to that Body, but as revealed in the hearts of 'Men, *&c. Christian Quaker*, part 1st, p. 101.

Ibid. p. 102. 'But I further confess, That his 'Righteous Life, *with respect to his Appearance in 'that Body*, was grieved by Sin, and that the 'Weight of the Iniquity of the whole World, 'with the Concernment of its Eternal Well-'being, lay hard upon him, nor was his *Man-'hood* insensible of it. *&c.*

Again,

Again, *ibid.* 'The Invisible, Spiritual and 'Divine Life, Principle, or Nature, was the 'Root and Fountain of all, which is sometimes 'ascribed in Scripture to the Body, by that 'common Figure, or way of Speaking amongst 'Men, the Thing containing (which was the 'Body) for the Thing contained (which was 'the Eternal Power, Wisdom, Life, *&c.*) *Not 'that we would irreverently rob the holy Body of 'whatsoever acknowledgment is justly due*; nor 'yet separate that God joined: Though I con-'fess, with holy Fear, I dare not attribute to an 'Eternal prepared Being, that which is the na-'tural, proper and only Work of the Divine 'Light and Life to operate and effect.

Again, *ibid.* p. 104. 'We do confess, that 'though the Eternal Power, Life and Light, 'which inhabited *that holy Person, which was Born 'at* Nazareth, was and is chiefly and eminently 'the Saviour, (For *there is no Saviour besides 'me*, saith God, *Hos.* 13, 4.) Yet that *it was 'Instrumentally a Saviour*, as prepared and cho-'sen for the Work which Christ had then to do 'in it; which was actually to the Salvation of 'some, and intentionally of the whole World, '*&c.*

Again, *ibid.* p. 107. 'But there is yet a fur-'ther Benefit that accrueth *by the Blood of Christ*, '*viz.* That Christ is a Propitiation and Re-'demption to such as have Faith *in it*; for 'though I still place the stress of particular Be-'nefit upon the Light, Life and Spirit revealed, 'witnessed in every particular: Yet in that ge-'neral Appearance there was a general Benefit

'justly

'justly to be attributed unto *the Blood of that very* '*Body of* Christ, to wit, that *it did propitiate.* 'For however it might draw ſtupendious Judg-'ments upon the Heads of thoſe who were Au-'thors of that Diſmal Tragedy, and died im-'penitent: Yet doubtleſs, it thus far turned to 'very great Account, in that *it was a moſt pre-'cious Offering in the ſight of the Lord*, and drew 'God's Love the more eminently unto Man-'kind, at leaſt ſuch as ſhould believe in his 'Name, *&c.*

Again, *ibid.* p. 108. 'Yet doubtleſs greatly 'did it influence to ſome ſingular Tenderneſs, 'and peculiar Regard unto all ſuch, who ſhould 'believe in his Name, among other of his 'weighty Performances, for the ſake of that '*laſt* and *greateſt* of all his External Acts, the '*reſiſting unto Blood*, for the Spiritual good of the 'World, thereby *offering up himſelf upon the* '*Croſs*, through the Power of the Eternal Spi-'rit, that Remiſſion of Sin (God's Bounty to 'the World) might be Preacht in his Name, 'and *in his very Blood too*, as that, which was 'the moſt ratifying of all his Bodily Sufferings. 'And indeed, therefore might it ſeem meet to 'the Holy Ghoſt, that Redemption, Propitia-'tion and Remiſſion ſhould be declared, and 'held forth *in the Blood of Chriſt* unto all, that 'have right Faith therein, (*Rom.* 3. 25. *Eph.* 1. '7.) —becauſe it implies a firm Belief, that '*Chriſt was come in the Fleſh*, and that none could 'then have him as their Propitiation or Re-'demption, who withſtood the acknowledg-'ment of, and Belief in his *viſible Appearance*,

'which

'which *John* tells us, ſome denied and with-
'ſtood.

Again, *ibid.* p. 109. 'Conſider what I ſay,
'with this Qualification, that ultimately and
'chiefly, not *wholly* and *excluſively*, the Divine
'Life in that Body was the Redeemer. For *the*
'*Sufferings of that holy Body of Jeſus* had an en-
'gaging and procuring Virtue in them, though
'the Divine Life was that Fountain from whence
'originally it came. And as the Life declared
'and preached forth it ſelf through that *holy*
'*Body*; ſo who did come to the Benefit procu-
'red by the Divine Life, could only do it
'through an hearty Confeſſion to it, *as appearing*
in that Body, &c.

Again, *ibid.* p. 110. 'It was never intended
'that any ſhould barely reſt in that (*viz.* the
'knowledge of the outward Appearance or Ma-
'nifeſtation of Chriſt in the Body prepared for
'him;) but preſs after the Knowledge of Chriſt
'by Faith in ſome thing farther, and beyond
'that Body in which he appeared, *not excluding*
'*our Belief in that too.*

Again, *ibid.* p. 111. 'By Chriſt's *viſible Ap-*
'*pearance*, and in his Name, was Remiſſion,
'Pardon, or Forgiveneſs preached, or held
'forth to the whole World, upon their believ-
'ing therein, *more eminently than ever.* And a
'few Lines lower, —'Which hath been in
'all former Ages, but *never ſo eminently held forth*
'to the World, as by *the Coming of Jeſus Chriſt*
'*in the Fleſh*,

Again, *ibid.* p. 112. 'Nor is this all the Good
'the Life and Sufferings of that *bleſſed Manhood*

 'brought

'brought unto the World. For, having been 'enabled so effectually to *perform* the Will of God 'living, and so patiently *suffer* the Will of wick-'ed Men *dying*, therein freely *offering up his* 'most Innocent Life for the World: He cer-'tainly obtained exceeding great and precious 'Gifts, which, as every Man comes to believe 'in the Light, wherewith Christ Jesus hath en-'lightened him, and to be led by it, he shall 'assuredly feel a particular Benefit to him, ac-'cruing from that general one, procured by him 'who so *laid down his Life for the World.*

Again, in the same Page, 'We cannot but 'acknowledge him *a Saviour in that very Mani-'festation, or Coming in that prepared Body*, &c.

And again, in p. 113. 'In short, he was the 'general Saviour in that *eminent Appearance at* 'Jerusalem, in which he did so many great and 'good things for Mankind: And a particular 'Saviour, as we find him in our Hearts an Holy 'Light, shewing Sin, reproving for Sin, and 'Converting from it into the holy Nature of 'the Light, to be Flesh of his Flesh, and Bone 'of his Bone. Thus far out of that one Book 'of *W. P's.*

Now for a Close, let me add one Testimony from *G. Keith* himself; it is in his Appendix to his Book, called, *Immediate Revelation not ceased*, p. 243. where he says thus; 'And here I give 'the Reader an Advertisement, that although 'the World's Searchers, (I suppose it should 'be Teachers) and Professors of Christ in the 'Letter, accuse us as Deniers of Christ, at least 'as Man, yet that *the Doctrine and Principles of*

'the

'*the People called Quakers, as well as the People, do* '*indeed more acknowledge the Man Christ Jesus,* 'and do more impute all our Blessings and Mer-'cies that are given us of God, as conveyed un-'to us through him, unto the Man Jesus, than 'any of them all, *&c.* This is so full a Testi-mony for the Quakers, and against himself, that I shall not need to add more; save only to observe to the Reader, that *G. K.* published this Testimony, on Behalf of the People called Quakers, *long after those Books were printed*, out of which he now picks his Cavils against them.

T. E.

ERRATA.

PAge 13. Line 17. for *have* r. *had*. p. 14. l. 31. r. *sham*. p. 29. l. 33. dele *well as*. p. 39. l. 1. after *extravagant*, dele the *Comma*. p. 43. l. 30. f. *Lamp*, r. *Lump*. p. 45. l. 26. r. *Race*, r. *Case*. p. 45. l. 29. f. *seasonable*, r. *reasonable*. p. 58. l. 12. d. *contradict*. p. 59. l. 26. r. *discretion*. l. 30. f. *opened*, r. *owned*. p. 60. l. 29. f. *formerly* r. *formally*. p. 62. l. 9. f. *two*, r. *to*. p. 63. l. 29. r. *Terms*. p. 70. l. 11. f. *the comparing*, r. *comparing the*. p. 71. l. 16. r. *Stately*. l. 25. r. *things*. p. 73. l. 16. d. *and*. p. 86. l. 13. f. *there*, r. *their*. p. 93. l. 24. r. *Opponents*. p. 94. l. 21. d. *those*. p. 100. l. 29. r. *Blood*. p. 109. l. 26. f. *Pauls*, r. *Paul*. p. 111. l. 32. r. *own*, r. *one*, p. 115. last line r. *took of*. p. 134. l. 21. r. *where*. p. 135. l. 11. r. *God's*.

The END.